COMMENTARIES ON PINDAR

MNEMOSYNE

BIBLIOTHECA CLASSICA BATAVA

COLLEGERUNT

A. D. LEEMAN · H. W. PLEKET · C. J. RUIJGH

BIBLIOTHECAE FASCICULOS EDENDOS CURAVIT

C. J. RUIJGH, KLASSIEK SEMINARIUM, OUDE TURFMARKT 129, AMSTERDAM

SUPPLEMENTUM CENTESIMUM PRIMUM

W. J. VERDENIUS

COMMENTARIES ON PINDAR

VOLUME II

COMMENTARIES ON PINDAR

VOLUME II, OLYMPIAN ODES 1, 10, 11, NEMEAN 11, ISTHMIAN 2

BY

W. J. VERDENIUS
Emeritus Professor of Greek Language and
Literature in the University of Utrecht

E.J. BRILL
LEIDEN • NEW YORK • KØBENHAVN • KÖLN
1988

The publication of this book has been made possible by a grant from the Netherlands Organisation for the Advancement of Pure Research (Z.W.O.)

Library of Congress Cataloging-in-Publication Data
(Revised for volume 2)

Verdenius, W. J. (Willem Jacob)
Commentaries on Pindar.

(Mnemosyne, bibliotheca classica Batava.
Supplementum, ISSN 0169-8958; 97,)
Vol. has imprint: Leiden; New York: E. J. Brill.
Includes bibliographical references and indexes.
Contents: v. 1. Olympian odes 3, 7, 12, 14 — v. 2.
Olympian odes 1, 10, 11, Nemean 11, Isthmian 2.
1. Pindar—Criticism and interpretation.
I. Pindar. Selections. 1987. II. Title. III. Series:
Mnemosyne, bibliotheca classica Batava. Supplementum; 97, etc.
PA4276.V4 1987 884'.01 87-138334
ISBN 90-04-08126-7 (pbk. : v. 1)
ISBN 90-04-08535-1 (pbk. : v. 2)

ISSN 0169-8958
ISBN 90 04 08535 1

©Copyright 1988 by E.J. Brill, Leiden, The Netherlands

All rights reserved. No part of this book may be reproduced or translated in any form, by print, photoprint, microfilm, microfiche or any other means without written permission from the publisher

PRINTED IN THE NETHERLANDS BY E.J. BRILL

CONTENTS

Preface vii
Abbreviations ix
Olympian 1 1
Olympian 10 53
Olympian 11 87
Nemean 11 96
Isthmian 2 119
Index of Subjects 148
Index of Greek Words 152

PREFACE

The choice of the odes commented upon in this volume has been determined by outward circumstances, just as that made in Volume I. When I was preparing a review of Gerber's edition of Olympian 1, it soon appeared that my notes would be too numerous and extensive to be published as an article. Accordingly, my comments on this ode are intended to form a supplement to Gerber's work[1]. Olympians 10 and 11 have been studied thoroughly by Viljoen, but his views have to be revised in the light of recent research. The commentaries on *N.* 11 and *I.* 2 have been reprinted (with a number of modifications and additions) from ICS 7, 1 (1982), 16-40, and Mnem. IV 35 (1982), 1-37.

Still more than in volume I, I have pointed out peculiarities of grammar and nuances of meaning, and I have not shrunk from dwelling on things which might seem rather obvious or elementary. On the other hand, I have not lost my suspicion when looking at modern constructions of unified composition. It is true that Pindar's language should be pressed "until the blood comes" (see note on *I.* 2, 2 συναντόμενοι), but the details should not be pressed so as to form a network of formal parallels and analogies. It is also true that the meaning of a poem is closely connected with its form, but the interpreter should not sacrifice verbal accuracy to aesthetic feeling.

I am indebted to Professor S. L. Radt for a number of useful remarks and additional references concerning *O.* 1.

W.J.V.

---

[1] I have paid special attention to Fennell's second edition, because this has not been used by Gerber.

ABBREVIATIONS

Ang. Bern. — P. Angeli Bernardini, *Eracle, i Molioni e Augia nell' Olimpica 10 di Pindaro*, QUCC 11 (1982), 55-68.

Barkhuizen — J. H. Barkhuizen, *Etymologisering by Pindaros* (Diss. Pretoria 1975).

Becker — O. Becker, *Das Bild des Weges und verwandte Vorstellungen im frühgriechischen Denken* (Hermes Einzelschr. 4, Berlin 1937).

Bernard — M. Bernard, *Pindars Denken in Bildern* (Pfullingen 1963).

Bo. — C. M. Bowra, *Pindari carmina* (Oxford 1935).

Bo. — C. M. Bowra, *The Odes of Pindar* (Harmondsworth 1969).

Bowra — C. M. Bowra, *Pindar* (Oxford 1964).

Bruhn — E. Bruhn, *Sophokles, Anhang* (Berlin 1899).

Bundy — E. L. Bundy, *Studia Pindarica* (Berkeley-Los Angeles 1962).

Bury — J. B. Bury, *The Nemean Odes of Pindar* (London 1890).

Bury — J. B. Bury, *The Isthmian Odes of Pindar* (London 1892).

Burz. — G. Burzacchini-E. Degani, *Lirici greci* (Florence 1977).

Conw. — G. S. Conway, *The Odes of Pindar* (London 1972).

Denn. — J. D. Denniston, *The Greek Particles* (^{2}Oxford 1954).

Dorns. — F. Dornseiff, *Pindar übersetzt und erläutert* (Leipzig 1921).

Dorns. — F. Dornseiff, *Pindars olympische Hymnen* (Leipzig 1938).

Dorns., *P.S.* — F. Dornseiff, *Pindars Stil* (Berlin 1921).

Duchemin — J. Duchemin, *Pindare, poète et prophète* (Paris 1955).

Erbse — H. Erbse, *Bemerkungen zu Pindars 10. olympischer Ode*, in *Kleine Schriften* (Berlin 1979), 92-103.

Farn. — L. R. Farnell, *The Works of Pindar* (London 1930-2).

Fehling — D. Fehling, *Die Wiederholungsfiguren und ihr Gebrauch bei den Griechen vor Gorgias* (Berlin 1969).

Fenn. — C. A. M. Fennell, *Pindar: The Olympian and Pythian Odes* (^{2}Cambridge 1893).

Fenn. — C. A. M. Fennell, *Pindar: The Nemean and Isthmian Odes* (Cambridge 1883).

Fogelmark — S. Fogelmark, *Studies in Pindar* (Lund 1972).

Forssman — B. Forssman, *Untersuchungen zur Sprache Pindars* (Wiesbaden 1966).

Fränkel — H. Fränkel, *Dichtung und Philosophie des frühen Griechentums* (^{2}Munich 1962).

Fränkel, *W.u.F.* — H. Fränkel, *Wege und Formen frühgriechischen Denkens* (^{2}Munich 1960).

Gal. — M. Fernandez-Galiano, *Pindaro, Olimpicas* (Madrid 1956).

Ge. — D. E. Gerber, *Pindar's Olympian One: A Commentary* (Toronto-Buffalo-London 1982).

Gianotti — G. F. Gianotti, *Per una poetica pindarica* (Turin 1975).

Gild. — B. L. Gildersleeve, *Pindar: The Olympian and Pythian Odes* (London 1907).

Gund. — H. Gundert, *Pindar und sein Dichterberuf* (Frankfurt 1935).

Gund., *Mnem.* — H. Gundert, *Der alte Pindar*, in *Mnemosynon Th. Wiegand* (Munich 1938), 1-13.

Howie — J. G. Howie, *The Revision of Myth in Pindar, Ol. 1*, Pap. Liverp. Latin Semin. 4 (1983), 277-313.

Hubbard — Th. K. Hubbard, *The Pindaric Mind* (Leiden 1985).

Illig — L. Illig, *Zur Form der pindarischen Erzählung* (Berlin 1932).

Jur. — H. Jurenka, *Pindars erste und dritte olympische Ode*, Jahresber. Gymn. Wien 1893-94, 1-24.

Kaimio — M. Kaimio, *Characterization of Sound in Early Greek Literature* (Helsinki 1977).

Köhnken — A. Köhnken, *Pindar as Innovator: Poseidon Hippios and the Relevance of the Pelops Story in Olympian 1*, CQ 24 (1974), 199-206.

Köhnken, *Mythos* — A. Köhnken, *Die Funktion des Mythos bei Pindar* (Berlin-New York 1971).

Köhnken, *Time* — A. Köhnken, *Time and Event in Pindar O.1.25-53*, Class.Ant. 2 (1983), 66-76.

Kromer — G. Kromer, *The Value of Time in Pindar's Olympian 10*, Hermes 104 (1976), 420-36.

K.G. — R. Kühner-B. Gerth, *Grammatik der griechischen Sprache*, II: *Satzlehre* (Hannover 1898-1904).

KP — K. Ziegler-W. Sontheimer (edd.), *Der kleine Pauly* (Stuttgart 1964-75).

Latt. — R. Lattimore, *The Odes of Pindar* (Chicago 1947).

Le. — L. Lehnus, *Pindaro, Olimpiche* (Milan 1981).

Lefkowitz — M. Lefkowitz, *Pindar's Nemean XI*, JHS 99 (1979), 49-56.

LSJ — H. G. Liddell-R. Scott-H. Stuart Jones-R. McKenzie, *Greek-English Lexicon* (Oxford 1925-40).

Luther — W. Luther, *Wahrheit und Lüge im ältesten Griechentum* (Borna-Leipzig 1935).

Maehler — H. Maehler, *Die Auffassung des Dichterberufs im frühen Griechentum* (Göttingen 1963).

Me. — F. Mezger, *Pindars Siegeslieder* (Leipzig 1880).

Nassen — P. J. Nassen, *A Literary Study of Pindar's Olympian 10*, TAPA 105 (1975), 219-40.

Nis. — F. J. Nisetich, *Pindar's Victory Songs* (Baltimore-London 1980).

Nisetich — F. J. Nisetich, *Convention and Occasion in Isthmian 2*, Calif. St. Class. Phil. 10 (1977), 133-56.

Norwood — G. Norwood, *Pindar* (Berkeley-Los Angeles 1945).

Pavese — C. Pavese, *Χρήματα, χρήματ' ἀνήρ ed il motivo della liberalità nella seconda Istmia di Pindaro*, QUCC 2 (1966), 103-112.

Péron — J. Péron, *Les images maritimes de Pindare* (Paris 1974).

Priv. — C. A. Privitera, *Pindaro. Le Istmiche* (Milan 1982).

Pu. — A. Puech, *Pindare, Olympiques* ([2]Paris 1931).

Pu. — A. Puech, *Pindare, Néméennes, Isthmiques* (Paris 1923).

Race — W. H. Race, *Negative Expressions and Pindaric ποικιλία*, TAPA 113 (1983), 95-122.

Radt — S. L. Radt, *Pindars zweiter und sechster Paian* (Amsterdam 1958).

Rumpel — J. Rumpel, *Lexicon Pindaricum* (Leipzig 1883).

Ruijgh — C. J. Ruijgh, *Autour de 'TE épique'* (Amsterdam 1971).

Sand. — J. Sandys, *The Odes of Pindar* (London-New York 1915).

Schad. — W. Schadewaldt, *Pindars Olympische Oden* (Frankfurt 1972).

Schadewaldt — W. Schadewaldt, *Der Aufbau des Pindarischen Epinikion* (Halle 1928).

Schadewaldt, *Bem.* — W. Schadewaldt, *Bemerkungen zu Pindars 10. olympischer Ode*, in *Hellas und Hesperien*, I (Berlin 1979), 92-103.

Schmid — W. Schmid, *Geschichte der griechischen Literatur*, I (Munich 1929).

Schr. — O. Schroeder, *Pindari carmina* (Leipzig 1900).

Schwenn — F. Schwenn, *Der junge Pindar* (Greifswald 1940).

Schw. — E. Schwyzer, *Griechische Grammatik* (Munich 1939-50).

Segal — C. P. Segal, *God and Man in Pindar's First and Third Olympian Odes*, HSCP 68 (1964), 211-67.

Simpson	—	M. Simpson, *The Chariot and the Bow as Metaphors for Poetry in Pindar's Odes*, TAPA 100 (1969), 437-73.
Sitzler	—	E. Buchholz-J. Sitzler, *Anthologie aus den Lyrikern der Griechen*, II ([5]Leipzig-Berlin 1909).
Slater	—	W. J. Slater, *Lexicon to Pindar* (Berlin 1969).
Snell	—	B. Snell, *Die Entdeckung des Geistes* ([4]Göttingen 1975).
Sn.M.	—	B. Snell-H. Maehler, *Pindarus, Epinicia* ([6]Leipzig 1980).
Strohm	—	H. Strohm, *Tyche. Zur Schicksalsauffassung bei Pindar und den frühgriechischen Dichtern* (Stuttgart 1944).
Thummer	—	E. Thummer, *Pindar. Die isthmischen Gedichte*, I (Heidelberg 1968).
Thu.	—	*Id.*, vol. II.
Thummer, *Religiosität*	—	E. Thummer, *Die Religiosität Pindars* (Innsbruck 1957).
Tur.	—	A. Turyn, *Pindari carmina cum fragmentis* (Oxford 1952).
Vilj.	—	G. van N. Viljoen, *Pindaros se tiende en elfde Olympiese odes* (Leiden 1955).
de Vries	—	G. J. de Vries, *Het feest van Aristagoras*, Hermeneus 36 (1965), 149-57 = *De zang der Sirenen* (Baarn-Amsterdam 1986), 97-106.
Wackernagel	—	J. Wackernagel, *Vorlesungen über Syntax* ([2]Basel 1926-28).
We.	—	O. Werner, *Pindar. Siegesgesänge und Fragmente* ([3]Zurich-Munich 1968).
Wil.	—	U. von Wilamowitz, *Pindaros* (Berlin 1922).
Wil., *Gl.*	—	U. von Wilamowitz, *Der Glaube der Hellenen* (Berlin 1931-2).
Woodbury	—	L. Woodbury, *Pindar and the Mercenary Muse*, TAPA 99 (1968), 527-42.
Wüst	—	E. Wüst, *Pindar als geschichtschreibender Dichter* (Tübingen 1967).

OLYMPIAN 1

Metre

Ge. abstains from giving names to the various cola, because "there is little agreement on the metrical analysis of the ode" (p. VIII). The following scheme, mainly based on Wilamowitz, *Griechische Verskunst*, 415-6, seems to me the most satisfactory, i.e., the most simple and unitary:

gl pher
do 2 *da*
lec[1]
pher
5 *lec*
3 *tr cho do*
2 *tr cho cr*[2]
3 *ia*
do cr
10 2 *do*[3]
do ia
23 *ia cr*[4] 2 *do*
pher do[5]
25 *cr chodim cr*[6]
2 *do reiz*
chodim do
gl do
28b *dodr cr*
2 *do cho ba*

For the irregular responsion at 89 and 104 see notes *ad loc.*

Composition

Ge. (XI-XV) argues that the unity of the ode is based on a number of analogies between Hiero and Pelops, and even concludes that "the

[1] Sn.M. *cr ia*, but a trochaic rhythm is more natural after the dactyls.
[2] The ambivalent character of the cretic forms a suitable transition to the iambics, the resolved form of which facilitates the transition.
[3] Tur. and Sn.M. propose *ba ia cr*, but a bacchius preceding a iambus seems unusual. Similarly, I do not accept an initial bacchius at 29 (Sn.M.).
[4] W. J. W. Koster, *Traité de métrique grecque* ([3]Leiden 1962), 281-2, implausibly assumes a *lec* with anaclasis.
[5] Koster's suggestion (*loc. cit.*) *ia cho lec* makes an unnatural combination.
[6] Koster's *ityph chodim* is certainly to be rejected.

myth's real significance rests in the praise it confers upon Hieron" through these analogies, and that "it is no doubt implied that after his death Hieron too will receive similar worship as a hero". Such an implication seems to me improbable because Pindar's final blessing refers to Hiero's earthly life (see below, note on 115 τοῦτον). But the alleged analogies do not stand a critical examination either. It is true that Pelops enjoys divine favour and that Pindar wishes Hiero divine favour, but such a wish is a *topos* in his poetry (cf. Thummer, 103-4) and in its present form is not specific enough to have structural significance[7]. Ge. further thinks that the banquet given by Tantalus has parallels at 17, 61, 90, 98, so that 'banquet' is "a theme which ... contributes to the unity of the ode as a whole". But (1) sympotic entertainment (17, 61) is different from a banquet (N.B. 15 μουσικᾶς), (2) offerings to the dead (90) hardly parallel a dinner or a symposium of living persons, and (3) εὐδία (98) is a much wider notion than "tranquillity at the symposium" (as is implicitly admitted by Ge. in his note *ad loc.*)[8]. Ge.'s assumption of analogies between Poseidon's love of Pelops (25, 41) and a god's concern for Hiero (106-7), between καλῶν at 84 and at 104 (where the word primarily refers to artistic sense, just as at *O.* 11, 18), between 82-4 and 99-100 (which refers to the vicissitude of fortune), between 83 σκότῳ and 23 λάμπει (two instances of the common *topos* 'light-darkness'), and between κράτει at 22 and at 78 (a common word for 'victory': cf. *I.* 8, 5 and the frequent use of κρατέω) is equally gratuitous. See further below, notes on 37 εὐνομώτατον, 38 φίλαν, 42 δῶμα Διός, 48-51, 48 ὕδατος, 55 καταπέψαι, 57 πατήρ, 58 εὐφροσύνας, 59 βίον, 83 καθήμενος, 84 ἄεθλος, 91 μέμικται, 92 Ἀλφεοῦ ... κλιθείς, 98-9, 103 ξένον, 112 ἀλκᾷ, 115 ὑφοῦ.

Other attempts to discover analogies between the myth and the other sections of the ode are not convincing either. Thummer (*Religiosität*, 84) and Köhnken (200) compare 23 λάμπει δέ οἱ κλέος with 93-5 τὸ δὲ κλέος/ τηλόθεν δέδορκε τᾶν Ὀλυμπιάδων ἐν δρόμοις/ Πέλοπος, but if Πέλοπος is taken to go with κλέος the meaning of ἐν cannot be satisfactorily explained (Pu.'s 'grâce à l'arène d'Olympie' is obviously impossible). Thummer's other parallels (e.g. between 14 ἀγλαΐζεται and 91 ἀγλααῖσι, between ὕπατον at 42 and at 100) are so far-fetched that they need not be discussed. Köhnken (202) further argues that "the theme of the divine horses seems to be one of the most important unifying elements in the structure of the ode". But Poseidon's chariot (41, 87) can hardly be

[7] F. Cairns, Hermes 105 (1977), 132, tries to force the analogy by calling Hiero "beloved of a god".

[8] Hubbard (158) writes: "Tantalus' perversion of *xenia* is a foil to the maintenance of hospitality and festivity by Pelops, in his role as cupbearer to the gods. And *of course* [my italics], Pelops is a paradigm for Hieron". But a cupbearer is not a host.

intended to form an analogy to the single horse which won Hiero's victory. Köhnken (205) refers to the hope of a victory in the chariot-race expressed at 109-11[9], but that is a side reflection, not part of a 'theme'. See further below, on 64 λαθέμεν.

D. C. Young, *Three Odes of Pindar* (Leiden 1968), 121-3, argues that the topics of the ode are symmetrically arranged and that even the transitions between the sections are concentrically balanced. But the fact that the beginning and the end of the poem are dominated by the idea of superlative value is a mere coincidence, the formal similarity being less important than the functional difference. Young takes 8 to correspond to 112, but ἀμφιβάλλεται does not refer to missiles (see note *ad loc.*). The 'general praise of Hiero' does not begin at 8 (Young) but at 10. The second section on Olympic victory does not begin at 94 (Young) but at 97. The praise of the Olympic games (1-10, 93-6) has no place in Young's scheme. Young assumes a correspondence of 'transitional gnomes' at 53 and 64, but there are a number of gnomes within the Pelops-myth (28-35, 81-4), which are no less important, and a clearly transitional one (99-100) in Young's section 'Olympic victory'. These observations seem sufficient to show that Young's scheme is an artificial construction. For a more detailed criticism cf. C. M. J. Sicking, Mnem. IV 36 (1983), 60 ff., who rightly draws the conclusion (64) "that there is little or no correlation between the amount of attention paid to certain passages and their relevance for the poem as a whole".

On the other hand, Sicking's own attempt to connect the myth of Pelops with Hiero's victory is not successful either. He takes (66) 8 ὅθεν in a causal sense and then gives the following paraphrase: "just as Pelops became the founder of Olympia's fame, thanks to his position as *Poseidon's* favourite and through his *victory* over Oinomaos with the four-horsed chariot, so also will Hieron, with *Zeus*' special support (of which his *victory* with the race-horse Pherenikos is the proof), make a substantial contribution to the fame of Olympia, of which the anticipated victory in the chariot-race would be the reward". It should be noted (1) that Pindar does not allude to an analogy between Pelops' victory in the chariot-race and Hiero's future victory in the chariot-race (see above), (2) that the fame of Olympia is primarily connected with Zeus, and that it would be rather presumptuous to suggest that Hiero's victory would serve to heighten the fame of Olympia[10], and (3) that apart from a possible, but in my opinion strained, interpretation of 10-1, there is not the faintest

[9] Similarly T. Krischer, Graz.Beitr. 10 (1981), 70.

[10] Cf. Jur. on 10 Κρόνου παῖδα: "Der Cult der Götter und Heroen ist das Hauptmoment des Siegesfestes, die Person des Siegers spielt eine bescheiden untergeordnete Rolle".

suggestion that Hiero's victory will contribute to the fame of Olympia: Sicking (67) writes that the wording of 108-10 reveals "that this victory would have considerable significance for Olympia". He refers to a resemblance between 5-6 and 114, but this has only a formal significance (see below, note on 115 τοῦτον)[11].

It may be concluded that the myth serves to enhance the glory of Olympia and hence, indirectly, that of Hiero, but that from a literary point of view it forms a digression which does not have a specific connection with the praise of the victor.

Commentary

1: ἄριστον. Ge. lists eight points of view from which water was considered to be pre-eminent in the world[12], and concludes (p. 4) that "something like πάντων is presumably intended to be understood". But 2 πλούτου suggests that a special field is meant. Similarly, in the parallel passage *O.* 3, 42 gold is said to be pre-eminent among κτέανα. This seems to imply that water is pre-eminent among *natural* goods. Ge. rightly observes that "Greece is a dry land and the generative power of water was therefore brought home to them with particular force". Cf. also *O.* 11, 1-2 ἔστιν ἀνθρώποις ἀνέμων ὅτε πλεῖστα/χρῆσις, ἔστιν δ' οὐρανίων ὑδάτων. It may further be concluded that ἄριστον means 'most profitable' (cf. my note on Hes. *Op.* 24) and that the meaning of the priamel is a practical one: just as water is needed to maintain man's physical life[13], so victories in the great games are necessary to maintain the 'life' of his ἀρετή[14]. See further my note on *O.* 3, 42.

Hubbard (154; similarly 14) observes that "water in Pindar often stands as a symbol for poetry—in its fluid, polymorphic, gently flowing, refreshing, even regenerative aspects". It is true that the victor's fame is imagined as a plant fostered by poetry as by a life-giving stream of water (cf. *N.* 7, 62, *N.* 8, 40, and see my commentary on *O.* 12, 15

[11] Sicking further writes that 113-4 τὸ δὲ ... βασιλεῦσι "states in so many words that Hieron's contribution to Olympia's fame can be regarded as perfecting what Pelops has done as the founder of Olympia", but this is an unnatural interpretation: see below, on 113 κορυφοῦται.

[12] Fenn. wrongly thinks that "Hieron's naval exploits and his special leaning to the cult of Poseidon give appropriateness to this encomium of water". For the use of superlatives in priamels cf. Bundy I, 11 n. 33.

[13] Cf. schol. εἰς τὸ ζῆν and Arist. *Rhet.* 1364 a 26 ὅτι ἡ χρῆσις ὑπερέχει.

[14] Accordingly, there is no "Fortschritt vom Allgemeinen zum Besonderen" (Sitzler). Fränkel (538-9) suggests that the idea of water being the principle of vegetative life stems from Heraclitus, but he admits that in his system fire is the 'higher' principle of life: Pindar does not draw such a distinction between two levels of life, nor does his priamel proceed from a lower to a higher principle. See further W. H. Race, *The Classical Priamel from Homer to Boethius* (Leiden 1982), 76.

κατεφυλλορόησεν), but in the priamel the vitalizing power of water is obviously conceived in a more general perspective. Hubbard (155) assumes a "basic antithesis" between "water (μέν) and gold (δέ), poetry and wealth, subject and object. Water (= poetry) is pure, elemental, and absolute: poetry, like water, can never be destroyed. It is therefore ἄριστον": this is a misleading argument, for the resemblance between water and poetry does not warrant the assumption that water "stands for" poetry.

1: ὁ. Ge. writes that "the article may have a certain demonstrative force[15], but its main function seems to be one of contrast or antithesis". But at *O.* 3, 42, where there is a similar contrast, χρυσός is used without article. Ge. further notes that "the absence of the article with ὕδωρ may indicate that ὕδωρ belongs to the class of ... those nouns which, like proper nouns, describe something existing only once". But proper nouns are often used with the article. It may be concluded that in the present passage gold is regarded as a universal power and hence as a kind of proper noun (cf. fr. 222 Διὸς παῖς ὁ χρυσός; similarly *P.* 3, 86 ὁ μέγας πότμος, *P.* 4, 286 ὁ καιρός), whereas at *O.* 3, 42 it is viewed as an object among objects. Similarly 81 ὁ ... κίνδυνος, where Ge. quotes Gildersleeve, *Syntax* II, 257: "the article with the abstract is almost on a line with the articular names of the gods". Accordingly, Hubbard (155) seems to me wrong in writing that gold "is a product of convention".

1: δέ. Ge. writes that "the particle is connective rather than adversative, since the μὲν ... δὲ ... δέ series is a paratactic list of areas in each of which one item excels". But δέ not merely connects these areas but also marks their difference.

1: χρυσός. Ge. argues that "to Pindar as to other Greeks, gold is an object of praise because it is the most valuable of material possessions and its gleam is an incidental attribute which serves to enhance the value it already has". The latter part of this sentence, however, seems to be contradicted by the observation that "what Pindar is stressing here is the pre-eminent radiance of gold": Pindar does not emphasize an 'incidental attribute', but an essential aspect, which includes both visual gleam or radiance (e.g. *P.* 4, 144 σθένος ἀελίου χρύσεον) and commercial value, and he could do so because in his view the universal power of light connects all superior things in the world: cf. Gund., 11 ff. This power of light is present in gold in a concentrated form. Accordingly, it is misleading to say, as is done by Ge., that the frequent association of gold with the gods owes its origin "not primarily to any gleam which was thought to radiate

[15] Fenn. is certainly wrong in thinking of the gold "which decorates this palace" (similarly Burz.).

from the gods, but to the practice of using gold, as the most costly of man's possessions, to adorn their images": the splendour of gold expresses its costliness as well as its pureness and imperishableness[16]. The association of preciousness with splendour also explains the use of χρύσεος as an epithet of such 'splendid' things as health (*P.* 3, 73), the olive (*O.* 11, 13), and the laurel (*P.* 10, 40)[17].

1: **πῦρ.** Fränkel (539, *W.u.F.*, 271 n. 1) suggests that the comparison of gold with fire was influenced by Heraclitus B 90, but (1) Heraclitus emphasizes the universal, not the supreme, value of gold, and (2) he disregards the radiance of gold and fire. See further below, on 2 νυκτί.

2: **διαπρέπει.** Ge. observes that we have to supply another διαπρέπει with χρυσός, and that "ellipse of this kind is common in Greek". Some parallels, however, would have been welcome: Fenn. compares *I.* 3-4, 36; see further K.G. II, 574-5.

2: **νυκτί.** Ge. compares E. *Rhes.* 617 διαπρεπεῖς ἐν εὐφρόνῃ, but neither this quotation nor his reference to *I.* 7, 5 and Emp. B 62, 2 and 84, 2 explains the literary function of νυκτί. Norwood (92-3) points out that Pindar likes to heighten the effect of a description by adding a contrasting background (e.g. at *Pae.* 2, 68-70 and fr. 87, 3)[18]. Fenn. unnecessarily suggests that "the simile of fire blazing at night may have reference to the eruption of Aetna, which began B.C. 479".

The addition of νυκτί further shows that the mention of fire has a purely illustrative, not a structural, function, and that Hubbard (155) is wrong in concluding that fire "is another primal element, and thus is set off against water. Fire shines (like the glory of the victor), but water reflects (like the words of the poet — cf. *N.* 7.14)".

2: **μεγάνορος.** Ge. rightly prefers 'proud', 'lordly' to 'great' (suggested by him as an alternative): cf. *P.* 10, 18 ἀγάνορα πλοῦτον, *O.* 3, 42 κτεάνων δὲ χρυσὸς αἰδοιέστατος. But the word probably has the overtone of 'making men great': cf. fr. 109 μεγαλάνορος Ἡσυχίας (wrongly translated by LSJ as 'high-souled'), *P.* 3, 55 ἀγάνορι μισθῷ, *I.* 1, 43 ἀγάνορα κόμπον. Pindar has a predilection for using adjectives in a causative sense: see my notes on *O.* 7, 1 ἀφνειᾶς and 11 ζωθάλμιος, *O.* 14, 16 ἐρασίμολπε, 21 κλυτάν, 24 κυδίμων.

---

[16] Bernard (16) rightly observes: "Das Licht ist ihm nicht nur Helle, sondern wirksames Wesen, das Sichtbarkeit, Dasein im eigentlichen Sinn verleiht und Leben bringt".

[17] Burz. wrongly concludes that purety and incorruptibility also characterize water (comparing Bacch. 3, 85-6).

[18] Bernard (33) goes too far in writing: "Gold verhält sich zum Reichtum wie das Licht zur Finsternis". Le. is equally wrong in speaking of a "polarità comica" and comparing the contrast between 71 ὄρφνᾳ and 94 δέδορκε. Similarly, Th.Hoey, HSCP 70 (1965), 253-4, assumes a contrast between νυκτί and 6 ἐν ἁμέρᾳ.

2: **ἔξοχα.** 'Most of' rather than 'more than' (Bo.): for ἔξοχος equivalent to a superlative cf. LSJ II 1 b.

2: **πλούτου.** Pindar often emphasizes the importance of wealth (e.g. *O.* 3, 42, *P.* 10, 18, *N.* 11, 13, *I.* 2, 11; see also Ge. on 10 ἀφνεάν), but adds that it should be used to realize ἀρετά: cf. Gund., 14, 28, 86-7.

3: **ἄεθλα.** Ge. criticizes Von der Mühll's arguments adduced to support the translation 'prizes', but still suggests that "possibly ... the ambiguity is deliberate and both meanings are intended". But 7 Ὀλυμπίας ἀγῶνα shows that only contests are meant. Fränkel (538 n. 2) rightly observes that Pindar emphasizes the importance of the Olympic games because the victory of a κέλης was not so important.

3: **γαρύεν.** Ge. prefers -ειν because there is no metrical necessity for -εν in Pindar. But see my note on *O.* 3, 25 πορεύεν.

Ge. further thinks that " 'to sing of' seems more appropriate here than 'to speak of' ". It seems more helpful to observe that γηρύω usually denotes a loud or emphatic utterance: cf. my note on Hes. *Op.* 260. Similarly 9 κελαδεῖν, 36 φθέγξομαι. For 'auditory display' in Pindar cf. Race, 100.

4: **φίλον ἦτορ.** Ge. observes that this "could be changed to Πίνδαρε without any real difference in meaning, whereas in the Homeric passage [υ 18 τέτλαθι δή, κραδίη] a similar change of κραδίη to Ὀδυσσεῦ would be impossible unless μοι in v. 19 were changed to the second person". It should be added that even such a change would not be sufficient: v. 22 καθαπτόμενος φίλον ἦτορ and other passages show that in the epic ἦτορ and similar words (θυμός, ψυχή, φρήν, etc.) are special powers and never represent the whole person: cf. my remarks in Lampas 3 (1970), 101 ff., 5 (1972), 98 ff.

Ge. thinks that Benveniste "may well be right in arguing that φίλος in Homer always preserves at least some affective significance". It seems more correct to say that the degree of affection implied varies according to the situation: see further my note on *O.* 7, 41 φίλοις.

5: **μηκέτι.** Ge. follows Bundy (II, 59 n. 55) in taking 'no further' to refer to the *topos* of 'the pillars of Heracles'. This is correct at 114, where ἔσχατον precedes (similarly *N.* 3, 20, *I.* 3-4, 29-31), but in the present passage the supreme quality of the sun is the conclusion, not the presupposition, of the sentence. For μηκέτι as a rhetorical reinforcement of μή cf. my notes on Tyrt. 6-7 D. = 10 W., 14, Mnem. IV 22 (1969), 345, and Hes. *Op.* 174. Ge. objects that "it is doubtful that superfluous ἔτι ever appears in Pindar", but cf. *N.* 5, 50. Sitzler takes ἔτι to go with ἐν ἁμέρᾳ ('wenn es einmal Tag geworden ist'; similarly Fenn.), but that phrase obviously belongs to φαεννόν.

5: **ἀελίου.** Ge. refers to L. L. Nash, AJP 96 (1975), 110-6, but the lat-

ter's assumption (111 n. 10) of an association between 'sun' and 'victory' here and at *O.* 13, 37 is an arbitrary idea. It is equally fantastic to say that "the sun ... represents the athletic contest", as is done by Hubbard (154). He refers to the fact that "the sun sees all ... and is conspicuous to all, just as the athletic contest provides an arena which will be seen by all", but this analogy is too vague to warrant the conclusion that the former "represents" the latter. "The association of the sun with the heat of athletic toil" (n. 85) is an even weaker argument[19]: 6 θαλπνότερον shows that the sun is considered from a completely different point of view (see note *ad loc.*). Hubbard (155) goes still further when he compares the unique character of the sun with the fact that "equestrian victory at Olympia is the pinnacle of success — the one end to which wealth can be devoted": this is wrong for the simple reason that the radiance of the sun illustrates the importance of the Olympic games (7 ἀγῶνα), not that of an Olympic victory.

5: **σκόπει.** The present imperative has prospective rather than durative (Ge.) force: cf. W. F. Bakker, *The Greek Imperative* (Amsterdam 1966), 31 ff., espec. 43 ff.

6: **ἄλλο.** Not "somewhat otiose" (Ge.), for the meaning is 'do not look for another star as being warmer'. Fenn. wrongly takes θαλπνότερον as an adverb qualifying φαεννόν.

6: **θαλπνότερον.** Ge. expresses his doubts with regard to Wil.'s suggestion (492) that the vitalizing power of the sun is emphasized, but he himself observes that θαλπνός, "unlike θερμός, signifies a fostering or vitalizing warmth". Similarly, the Olympic games are of vital importance in a literal sense because they enable a man to gain immortal fame.

6: **ἐν ἁμερᾳ.** Ge. writes that "the position of the phrase suggests that its force is to be felt both with the preceding and the following adjective". But the sense demands that it belongs to φαεννόν: see next note.

6: **φαεννόν.** Ge. thinks that this "reminds us of the brightness of fire in the opening verse ... and may suggest the metaphorical brightness that is shed upon Hieron as a result of his victory in the Olympic games". But he himself observes (p. 5) that the structural principle of a priamel is juxtaposition: just as there is no interconnection between water and wealth except the idea of vital indispensability, so the sun-warmth is a third precondition of life. 'Shining by day' has no other function than to

---

[19] He refers to *O.* 3, 24 (but 18 ξυνόν shows that the shadow is intended to protect the athletes as well as the spectators. Hubbard, 16 n. 19, writes: "One cannot help but also see in γυμνός an allusion to the state of the athletes", but 24 τούτων ... γυμνός cannot contain an ambiguity, for it refers to the time before the games were established), *O.* 13, 37 (but there 'sun' is equivalent to 'day'), and *N.* 7, 73 (but there the sun indicates the time of the day: cf. Paus. VI 24, 1).

distinguish the sun from the other stars. Accordingly, Ge.'s reference to *P.* 11, 48 ἀκτῖνα and other passages where victory is associated with radiance is irrelevant.

6: ἐρήμας. Ge. argues that 'barren' or 'lifeless' is to be preferred to 'devoid of other stars'. But there is no evidence for the former meaning (Hom. P 425 δι' αἰθέρος ἀτρυγέτοιο is not a probative parallel: cf. Fenn.), and the context of *O.* 13, 88 αἰθέρος ... ἐρήμου suggests that the meaning is 'empty' (as contrasted with an ordinary fight, which has the form of a φύλοπις). In the present passage the sky is empty, not "because the other celestial bodies lose all their brightness when the sun shines" (Ge.), but because the other stars are absent: cf. Simon. 605 μόνος ἅλιος ἐν οὐρανῷ[20].

6: αἰθέρος. Pindar chose this word, not "because it contributes to the emphasis on brightness in the ode's opening lines" (Ge.), but because the sun can exercise its warming power only in a bright sky. For this meaning of αἰθήρ see my note on *O.* 7, 67.

7: φέρτερον αὐδάσομεν. Ge. rightly defends the interpretation of αὐδάσομεν as a subjunctive. He is also right in pointing out that "there is no need to see a reference to the chorus in the plural": Jur. compares *O.* 2, 89 ἔπεχε ... βάλλομεν, *I.* 8, 6a-7 πέσωμεν ... θεράπευε. Cf. also *N.* 4, 37 ἀντίτεινε ... δόξομεν, and Fogelmark, 128 n. 62, who plausibly suggests that Pindar uses the *pluralis maiestatis* in order to emphasize the importance of his own action. Cf. also K.G. I, 83-4.

It should be added that φέρτερον is predicate (analogous to θαλπνότερον): such translations as Farn.'s 'nor let us tell of any strife more noble than the Olympian' (similarly Le.) show that the construction has been misunderstood.

The choice of φέρτερον shows that the utilitarian point of view which determined the priamel is continued: the Olympic games are 'most profitable' because their vitalizing, i.e. immortalizing, power is greater than that of the other games. For the pre-eminence of the Olympic games see my note on *O.* 12, 18 Πυθῶνος.

8: ὅθεν ... ὕμνος. Fenn.'s translation 'due to which' is misleading: for the idea that the song comes from Olympia see my note on *O.* 3, 9-10.

8: ὁ. Ge. rightly takes the article to have generic force. It may be added that this is a special case of the determinative use of the article (cf. Schw. II, 22, and my note on Hes. *Op.* 198), which in its turn is based on its originally deictic force.

---

[20] This parallel shows that Heracl. B 99 need not be Pindar's model, as is assumed by Fränkel, 539. Sitzler's explanation, "Der Himmel ist leer von anderen wärmeren Gestirnen", is not correct.

8: πολύφατος. Ge. rightly argues that this does not refer to the many voices of the chorus (e.g. Farn., Schmid, 576 n. 6) or the many sounds of the song (Wil., 492), but means 'renowned', 'glorious', just as at *P.* 11, 47 ἀγώνων πολυφάτων. Cf. also the similar use of κλυτός at 105 κλυταῖσι ... ὕμνων πτυχαῖς, *N.* 7, 16 κλυταῖς ἐπέων ἀοιδαῖς, *I.* 7, 19 κλυταῖς ἐπέων ῥοαῖσιν, etc. (cf. Kaimio, 159). But just as κλυτός in such contexts has the secondary meaning of 'glorifying' (see my note on *O.* 14, 21), so πολύφατος may have the overtone of 'making much spoken of' (cf. Dorns. 'ruhmverbreitend')[21].

8: ἀμφιβάλλεται. I agree with Fenn. and Ge. that no specific metaphor is involved. Similarly Schwenn, 241, who refers to Hom. K 535 ἵππων μ' ὠκυπόδων ἀμφὶ κτύπος οὔατα βάλλει. *P.* 9, 87 and *I.* 5, 28-9 compared by Ge. are further parallels[22]. Cf. also 19 ὑπὸ ... ἔθηκε.

9: σοφῶν. Ge. argues that this refers to technical skill as well as to knowledge of the appropriate content. He refers to Maehler, 94, but it should be added that Pindar's self-consciousness concentrates on his artistic competence: see my notes on *O.* 7, 53 σοφία and *O.* 14, 7 σοφός.

9: μητίεσσι. Ge. explains: " 'imaginings, devisings', often, as here, with the idea that such devisings are skilful, wise, clever". But skill is more relevant than wisdom: see preceding note. Ge. further calls 'song surrounds the imagination' "a more vivid and poetic equivalent of 'imagination produces song' ", but productive imagination does not occur in Greek thought before the Hellenistic age: see my remarks in Mnem. IV 36 (1983), 31, 55, 57-8. Accordingly, μῆτις is not "the actual source of song" (Ge.), but the ability to give it artistic form. Similarly *N.* 3, 9 μήτιος ἁμᾶς ἄπο, and Emp. B 23, 2 ἀμφὶ τέχνης ὑπὸ μήτιος εὖ δεδαῶτε said of painters.

10-1: ἀφνεὰν ... μάκαιραν. Burz. writes: "Si noti come ἀφνεάν ed ἑστίαν richiamino rispettivamente χρυσός e πῦρ del v. 1 (Méautis, p. 113)": an example of 'unitarianism' which disqualifies Méautis[23] as a critic of Pindar's poetry.

---

[21] Ge.'s objection, that "all other -φατος (φημί) compounds are passive", overlooks the fact that Pindar has a predilection for the causative use of adjectives: see above, on 2 μεγάνορος.

[22] Wil. (492) goes too far in assuming the implication, "Wenn der Hymnus den Gedanken des Dichters umgelegt wird, so wird ihnen auferlegt zu dichten". Ge. rightly rejects Nis.'s view (adopted by Le.) that the victor is to be understood as the object of ἀμφιβάλλεται. It may be added that the presence of μητίεσσι makes the ellipse of another dative extremely improbable. The double ambiguity suggested by Hubbard, 149 n. 66 (μητίεσσι both locative and instrumental, σοφῶν referring both to the poet and to the victor) turns the sentence into a riddle, which does not seem to me to suit the style of the victory ode.

[23] *Pindare le Dorien* (Neuchâtel-Paris 1962).

Bundy (I, 6) calls the mention of Hiero "the real climax" of the passage. He refers (n. 20) to the "insertion" of the name of Zeus before that of Hiero, but the phrase κελαδεῖν Κρόνου παῖδα implies that the sacred character of the games is a more important theme than Hiero's victory: see above, on 3 ἄεθλα and 5 ἀελίου. Cf. also note on *O.* 11, 11 νῦν. At any rate, the Greek text does not support Hubbard's conclusion (155), "As Zeus is preeminent among gods, so is Hieron among men".

10: ἱκομένους. For the use of the accusative Ge. refers to *I.* 6, 20-1 and Bruhn, § 121. Cf. also K.G. II, 111-2, and the parallels given by Fenn.

Ge. rightly observes that "Pindar often identifies himself with the 'arriving' poem": see further my notes on *O.* 7, 13 κατέβαν and *O.* 14, 18 ἔμολον.

12: θεμιστεῖον. Ge. writes that "Hiero ... is in a position to interpret and dispense θέμιτες, i.e., the ordinances or precedents which Zeus entrusts to kings". He refers to Hom. I 98-9, but H. Vos, *Θέμις* (Assen 1956), 3-4, 8-11, has shown that in that passage θέμιστες are personal privileges, and that generally jurisdiction did not belong to the task of the Homeric king. Afterwards (first in Hes. *Th.* 85) the θέμιστες in the sense of legal sentences, originally pronounced by special δικασπόλοι (A 238-9), were pronounced by the king. Ge. further writes that "there may be the suggestion that Hieron's rule is one which shows hospitality to guests, since θέμις and hospitality are often combined". But in that case Hiero's 'rule' is jurisdiction, for hospitality often was a legal question (cf. *O.* 8, 21-7, *I.* 9, 5-6).

Ge. thinks that θεμιστεῖον, which is not found elsewhere, "may have been coined to provide a balance for ἄριστον, and he even suggests that Χάρις δ', which occupies the same metrical position at 30, "may have been deliberately placed so as to reflect this sound [-ιστ-]". It should be borne in mind, however, that θεμιστεύω occurs in Homer (ι 114, λ 569) and that -ειος is a very common ending. Similarly, in his note on 13 Σικελίᾳ Ge. certainly goes too far in mentioning such fancies as the similarity in sound between 2 διαπρέπει and 13 -ίᾳ δρέπων[24].

12: πολυμάλῳ. Ge. rightly defends the form with α, referring to Sicily's fruitfulness. For μῆλον 'tree-fruit' cf. Hom. I 542; Burz. compares Demeter μαλοφόρος.

13: ἄπο. Ge. thinks that "it is uncertain whether Pindar meant that Hieron possessed the best ἀρεταί from among all possible ἀρεταί or the best part of every ἀρετά". The latter view (cf. Latt. 'reaping the crested

---

[24] Cf. p. 32, where he maintains that the repetition of παρέχων (21) at 39 "must be deliberate", but admits that the reason why escapes us.

heads of every excellence')[25] is certainly wrong, not only because it implies "an extravagant claim even for Hieron" (Ge.) but also, and even primarily, because 'culling the best part from every fruit' would be an unsavoury image. For κορυφή 'excelling instance' cf. *O.* 2, 13, *O.* 7, 4, and for ἀπό 'out of' cf. LSJ A I 6.

13: ἀρετᾶν. Not only 'virtues' (Ge., who refers to *P.* 3, 71) but also 'outstanding achievements', 'successes', as appears from δρέπων. For this meaning of ἀρετή see my notes on *O.* 3, 18 and *O.* 7, 43.

14: ἀγλαΐζεται. Ge. takes this to be passive: 'and in turn he is made resplendent' = 'is glorified' (similarly Latt.). But 16 παίζομεν certainly has a wider object than the glorification of Hiero. Most translators who take the verb to be middle assume the meaning 'delight in', but there are no parallels for such a subjective use[26]. The most obvious translation is 'shines', 'excels': cf. e.g. Hom. K 330-1 ἵπποισιν ... ἀγλαϊεῖσθε.

Ge. observes that "the finite tense disrupts the balance with δρέπων", but that "strict balance is often absent in Greek". He gives some examples from Pindar, but it should be added that our poet, just as Aeschylus[27], deliberately avoids symmetrical construction: see my notes on *O.* 3, 18 στέφανον, *O.* 7, 81 εὐτυχέων, *O.* 12, 18 τε.

15: μουσικᾶς. Artistic sensibility is a *topos* in the praise of cities and their rulers: cf. *O.* 10, 14, *O.* 11, 18, *O.* 13, 22, *P.* 4, 294-6, *P.* 5, 114, *P.* 6, 49, *P.* 10, 37, *N.* 7, 9, *I.* 2, 12 and 30-2, *Pae.* 4, 24; see further Bundy I, 25-6, Vilj., 24-5. Pindar emphasizes this quality in order to flatter his clients, but also because he assumes a connection between musicality and political ἡσυχία: cf. *P.* 1, 10-2, *P.* 4, 296, *P.* 5, 66-7, and Gund., 74-5.

15: ἐν. Quasi-instrumental (properly 'in the sphere of'). Ge. refers to Dodds' note on E. *Ba.* 159. Cf. also LSJ A III, K.G. I, 464-6. Similarly *O.* 5, 19, *P.* 5, 98, *N.* 11, 17, *I.* 5, 27.

15: ἀώτῳ. Ge. adopts the explanation proposed by R. A. Raman, Glotta 58 (1975), 195-207, but see my note on *O.* 3, 4.

16: οἷα. Not "exclamatory" (Ge.), but an "indefinite relative introducing epexegesis or expansion of a definite antecedent" (Fenn.).

16: παίζομεν. Ge. thinks that this refers to "a lighthearted, joyful song" (cf. Jur. 'heiter üben', Schwenn, 242 'unterhaltendes Singen', Burz. 'componiamo per diletto'), but Pindar is unlikely to have mentioned lighthearted songs as belonging to the finest products (ἄωτος) of

---

[25] Pu.'s 'qui cueille toutes les vertus sur leur plus haute tige' is obviously impossible.

[26] It seems significant that Semon. 7, 70 uses θυμὸν ἀγλαΐζεται for 'he delights'.

[27] Cf. W. A. A. van Otterlo, *Beschouwingen over het archaïsche element in den stijl van Aeschylus* (Utrecht 1937), 117 n. 1.

his art.[28]. The musical sense of the word, just as that of παιγμοσύνη at Stesich. 232 and of παῖγμα at E. *Ba.* 163, seems to be just as neutral as that of 'play'[29]. Similarly ἀθύρειν seems to have lost its connection with playfulness at *I.* 3-4, 57, where such translations as 'to disport themselves therewith' (Farn.) are impossible[30], and at *P.* 5, 23, where the κῶμος is called Ἀπολλώνιον ἄθυρμα, which does not mean 'to Apollo's delight' (LSJ, Nis.) but 'Apollo's playfellows' (Farn.). Cf. also *H.Herm.* 485, *H.Pan* 15, Bacch. 9, 87 and *epigr.* 3, 1.

16-7: φίλαν ... τράπεζαν. Ge. adopts Slater's suggestion that this contrasts with the dinner party given by Tantalus, but the two parties are no more comparable than singing and eating.

16: φίλαν. Rightly taken by Ge. to mean 'friendly', 'hospitable': cf. *N.* 5, 8 φίλαν ξένων ἄρουραν, Hom α 313 οἷα φίλοι ξεῖνοι ξείνοισι διδοῦσιν. But his explanation is not very clear and contains a number of irrelevant references. The praise of hospitality is a *topos* in Pindar, because the poet regards his work as a friendly office based on a ὁμιλία (116, *P.* 2, 96), i.e. on a personal relationship. Accordingly he is not shy of calling mighty rulers such as Hiero his ξένοι (103, *P.* 3, 69). See further Gund., 33 ff., Schadewaldt, 20 ff., Bowra, 386-8, Maehler, 88, Thummer, 101 and 156-8, Pavese, 109 n. 16, Gianotti, 14, Nis., 46, and my notes on *O.* 3, 1 φιλοξείνοις, *O.* 7, 4 γαμβρῷ, *N.* 11, 8 ξενίου, *I.* 2, 39 ξενίαν.

17: ἄνδρες. Has been added, not "because only men would be invited to a symposium" (Ge.), for this was commonly known, but because the single παίζομεν might be taken to refer to Pindar alone.

17: ἀλλά. Marks the transition from preliminary considerations to a call to action: cf. Denn., 14. Similarly 84, *O.* 10, 3, *N.* 11, 9, etc.

17: Δωρίαν. Ge. rightly argues that this does not refer to a particular kind of lyre or to a special musical mode. He is inclined "to follow those who explain the epithet as a reference to the Doric language of epinician and choral poetry in general". But the Doric elements do not seem to be sufficiently prominent to be said to characterize the genre as a whole: Pindar's dialect is "Epic with a tinge of Doric" (Fenn., XLIII)[31]. If we

---

[28] Consequently, Schwenn (244) is wrong in seeing a qualitative contrast between the poems sung at Hiero's table and the universal skill claimed by Pindar at 116. On the other hand, Fenn. (p. 2) is equally wrong in concluding that the present ode "was to be sung by a chorus of men (*v.* 17 ἄνδρες) at a banquet in Syracuse".

[29] Accordingly, W. J. Slater, CJ (1976-7), 200, is wrong in assuming a contrast between παίζομεν and ἄνδρες (similarly Le. 'giochiamo adulti').

[30] Bury's explanation, "song being a sport", is absurd. Norwood (173) even considers the use of the verb to expose the author of the poem as an impostor.

[31] Cf. also Gild., p. LXXVII, Wil., 101, and H. Maehler, *Die Lieder des Bakchylides*, I (Leiden 1982), 9: "so dass diese Kunstsprache keinem bestimmten Dialekt zugeordnet werden kann".

may trust the schol. on *O.* 1, 26g = fr. 67 Δώριον μέλος σεμνότατόν ἐστιν, the word perhaps refers to the solemn character of the victory ode[32].

18: εἰ. Ge. suggests that the chiastic correspondence between 3 εἰ ... 7 αὐδάσομεν and 18 λάμβαν', εἰ "makes the audience aware that ... from praise of the Olympic games Pindar moves to praise of Hieron's victory in those games". But that purpose is achieved in a simpler and more direct way by the phrase Πίσας τε καὶ Φερενίκου.

18: Πίσας τε καὶ Φερενίκου. Fenn. compares *N.* 4, 9-10 Νεμέᾳ/Τιμασάρχου τε πάλᾳ, but it should be added that the present phrase is not a mere *hendiadyoin* (see preceding note).

18: χάρις. There is an amazing variety of incorrect or semi-correct translations: 'the grace of poetry' (Gild.), 'delight in' (Fenn.; similarly Dorns.), 'the fair renown' (Farn.), 'Anmut und Kraft' (We.), 'beauty' (Bo., Nis.), 'grace' (Conw.). Ge. rightly chooses 'splendour, glory' (similarly Jur., Sitzler, Latt., Gianotti, 75, Le.), but it should be added that this and the other uses ('favour', 'gratitude', 'charm') are special aspects of the basic meaning 'quidquid efficit gaudium' (Rumpel). See further Gund., 30 ff., and the introduction to my commentary on *O.* 14.

19: ὑπό. 'Under the influence of': cf. LSJ B II 1-2.

19: φροντίσιν. Ge. objects to Farn.'s comment, "a perversion of the natural phrase 'has suggested sweetest thoughts to my mind' ", and points out that "it is not Pindar's νόος that is being stressed, but his φροντίς, his preoccupation as a poet". On the other hand, the term 'perversion' is not "too strong" (Ge.), for Pindar likes to invert natural relationships, and this tendency approaches mannerism: see below, on 53 ἀκέρδεια λέλογχεν, 81 λαμβάνει, and my notes on *O.* 7, 17 Δίκᾳ, 52 κέλευθοι, 83 ἔγνω νιν.

19: γλυκυτάταις. Ge. rightly compares 109 γλυκυτέραν, but in his note on that line he draws the misleading conclusion that the victor's success was "a 'sweetness' felt by the poet": the sweetness of the poet's thoughts primarily refers to the effect made by his song on the audience: cf. *O.* 10, 3, *N.* 9, 3, *I.* 2, 7, Becker, 78, and see my note on *O.* 7, 8 γλυκύν.

22: κράτει. 'Victory', not as "the result of might" (Ge.), but as the result of 'superior power' (LSJ II 2).

22: προσέμειξε. Ge. rightly rejects the suggestions put forward by T. Hoey, HSCP 70 (1965), 237-42. See further note on *I.* 2, 29 ἔμιχθεν. For more parallels cf. Dorns., *P.S.*, 94-6, Bowra, 227. Ge. writes: "Why Pindar should have been so fond of this metaphor is unclear". It may be

---

[32] This might also explain fr. 191 Αἰολεὺς (scil. αὐλός?) ἔβαινε Δωρίαν κέλευθον ὕμνων. Méautis (above, n. 23) certainly goes too far in suggesting that Pindar by alluding to Hom. θ 67 opposes his own serious poetry to the frivolous song of the Ionian Demodocus.

observed that the metaphor is as old as Hom. υ 203 (ἄνδρας) μισγέμεναι κακότητι καὶ ἄλγεσι, and that the image also occurs in prose, e.g. Hdt. VIII 58, 1 ἐθέλειν οἱ κοινόν τι πρῆγμα συμμεῖξαι. It probably was hardly felt as an image at all: cf. 'to mix in politics', 'to be mixed up in'. Cf. also προσμείγνυμι used in the sense of 'approach' at S. *Tr.* 821 and *Ph.* 106. It should be added, however, that Pindar likes to use spatial terms for the expression of all kinds of contact: cf. 8 ἀμφιβάλλεται, 19 ὑπὸ ... ἔθηκε, 78 πέλασον, 86 ἐφάψατο, 91 μέμικται, *N.* 1, 61 ποίαις ὁμιλήσει τύχαις, *N.* 3, 68 νᾶσον εὐκλέϊ προσέθηκε λόγῳ, *P.* 4, 296 ἡσυχίᾳ θιγέμεν. This predilection has the appearance of a mannerism.

23: Συρακόσιον. Ge. observes that "enjambement is an extremely common feature of Pindaric poetry". It may be added that it often gives emphasis: cf. Fenn.

23: ἱπποχάρμαν. Ge. observes that in Homer and at *Pae.* 2, 104 the word means 'fighting with horses', but thinks that in the present passage "the emphasis on Pherenicus suggests that 'delighting in horses' is the likelier meaning". But Ge. himself points out that χάρμα and χάρμη in Pindar refer to agonistic successes, and I doubt whether ἱπποχάρμης could mean 'delighting in victorious horses'. It may be added that warlike spirit is a *topos* in the praise of cities and their rulers: cf. *O.* 10, 15, *O.* 11, 17-9, *O.* 13, 23, *P.* 2, 1-2, Vilj., 27.

23: λάμπει. Ge. thinks that "it is possible that Pindar's choice here was influenced by the earlier reference to the sun", but he admits "that no reminiscence is required in order to explain Pindar's choice of the verb". He refers to Gund., 11 ff. and Duchemin, 194 ff., but it may be useful to mention some specific parallels: 93-4 τὸ δὲ κλέος/τηλόθεν δέδορκε, *P.* 11, 45 δόξ' ἐπιφλέγει, *N.* 3, 64 τηλαυγὲς ἄραρε φέγγος Αἰακιδᾶν, *I.* 3-4, 40-1 φάμαν ... λάμπει[33].

Ge. takes the phrase λάμπει κλέος to be a case of synaesthesia (cf. Bowra, 244, Kaimio, 234 ff.), "although the contrast is clearly not as marked as, for example, in ἔλαμπε ... φάμα (Soph. *OT* 473-5)". It should be added that the contrast is less marked because in Pindar's view light is a universal power comprising everything positive and superior (see above, on 1 χρυσός). Accordingly, 'renown is brilliant'—'renown rings clear' is not a real dilemma, as is suggested by Fenn.

23: οἱ. Ge. suggests that the dative may be both possessive and denoting interest. Schw. (II, 189) assumes the existence of a possessive dative (cf. also Wackernagel II, 77), but cf. K.G. I, 429-30. See also below, on 65 οἱ.

---

[33] Cf. also D. Bremer, *Licht und Dunkel in der frühgriechischen Dichtung* (Bonn 1976), 280-2 ('Ruhm als Licht').

24: εὐάνορι. Ge. writes: "Praise of the site where a victory was gained performs essentially the same function as praise of the victor's homeland". But the manliness of the inhabitants of Olympia does not seem to have much to do with the supreme status of the Olympic games. I am therefore inclined to take the word in a causative sense, just as ἀγάνωρ: see above, on 2 μεγάνορος.

24: Λυδοῦ. Ge. lists some far-fetched explanations of this addition, and points out that no special significance seems to be intended at *O.* 9, 9 Λυδὸς ἥρως Πέλοψ. But Fenn. already observed that Λυδοῦ serves as a specification of ἀποικίᾳ.

25: τοῦ. For the rhetorical significance of 28 θαύματα πολλά (preparing the way for the acceptance of the θαῦμα in Pindar's version of the tale) Ge. rightly refers to Bundy I, 8-9. It should be added, however, that the latter, as usually, goes too far in writing: "From the convention in which the legendary or mythical foil of a given ode is often introduced by a relative pronoun (τοῦ, line 25) the audience know that the laudator is committed to praise Pelops": the relative pronoun may equally well refer to beings which are far from praiseworthy (e.g. *P.* 1, 16).

25: ἐράσσατο. I strongly disagree with Ge.'s view that "since Pelops is an analogue of Hieron, the implication is that Hieron too enjoys divine love, although this love is of course not on the same physical level": Ge. refers to 107 κᾶδος, but that has nothing to do with love. See also above, p. 2.

Farn. writes: "Pindar's version ... is not happy, for he makes Poseidon fall in love with a new-born babe, which is not only quaint but contradicts his own account of the god's passion in ll. 36-41, where Pelops is a boy old enough to attend banquets". It may be answered (1) that Poseidon could conceive his love so early because as a god he was able to foresee into what a beautiful boy the baby would develop, and (2) that 41 δαμέντα φρένας ἱμέρῳ does not imply that the god then first conceived his love, but that he was seized by a sudden desire. Such a desire need not be explained by a special cause. Howie's assumption (289 and n. 93) that the whiteness of the boy's shoulder has an erotic connotation is unnecessary and unconvincing. His further speculations about the motivation of Poseidon's love (289 ff.) are needlessly complicated.

26: Ποσειδάν. Köhnken (202-3) rightly argues that Pindar has chosen Poseidon as the lover of Pelops because he is the patron of horsemanship, so that he can help Pelops in winning a victory over Oenomaus (87), divine help replacing the traditional but morally inferior motif of bribing Oenomaus' charioteer[34]. Fenn. (p. 3) wrongly thinks that "Hieron's

---

[34] It is not absolutely certain, however, that the Myrtilus story was then the standard version: cf. T. C. W. Stinton, Proc.Cambr.Phil.Soc. 202 (N.S. 22) (1976), 69.

naval exploits'' also ''account for the prominence of Poseidon in this ode''. Köhnken (*Time*, 75 n. 42) convincingly disproves Ge.'s suggestion (XII) that ''there is indirect evidence for a relationship between Poseidon and Pelops before Pindar''.

For the question whether this love is Pindar's own invention cf. Howie, 278 ff., who concludes that ''the helping roles of both Poseidon and Myrtilus were known before Pindar and were not necessarily always treated as mutually exclusive'', and even that Poseidon's love of Pelops may be traditional, but admits that ''a high degree of uncertainty exists''.

26: ἐπεί. Ge. rightly argues that this has temporal, not causal, force, but his suggestion that Pindar first presents the traditional story and then rejects it (cf. also p. XII) is unconvincing: (1) The πρότεροι mentioned at 36 can hardly include Pindar himself. (2) If the λέβης is identical with the cauldron implied at 48-9 (Ge., p. 57), the latter, defiled by the first cooking, has suddenly become 'pure' when it is used for Pelops' revivification, but in a record of the traditional version later to be rejected one expects the cauldron to have remained polluted (cf. Köhnken, *Time*, 70 and nn. 20 and 22, 72-3). The scholia take λέβητος to refer to a second cauldron, but Howie (281 ff.) rightly argues that this implies an unacceptable inconsistency in Pindar's version of the story. The purity of the λέβης is much easier to understand if Pindar is assumed to tell his own version of the birth of Pelops, a normal baby washed in a basin after its birth, but having an ivory shoulder. That might seem strange, but 'there are many marvels'.

Köhnken (*Time*, 71 and n. 28) objects that ''if we follow Gerber, we would nowhere be told what made Pelops so attractive for Poseidon'', and concludes that ἐπεί has causal force. But it is hardly conceivable that the god fell in love with the child *because* it had an ivory shoulder.

26: καθαροῦ. Refers to ritual purity: cf. Th. Wächter, *Reinheitsvorschriften im griechischen Kult*, RGVV IX:1 (1910), 25 ff. See also Howie, 285 and n. 59, who further observes that the emphatic position of the adjective, just as that of εὐνομώτατον at 37, probably serves to signal revision of the traditional story. At the same time the word seems to have the overtone of 'purifying': cf. Theocr. 24, 96 καθαρῷ δὲ πυρώσατο δῶμα θεείῳ, and Duchemin, 158-62. For the causative use of adjectives see above, on 2 μεγάνορος. For washing a new-born baby cf. Howie, 285 and n. 67, 286 and n. 71.

26: λέβητος. Ge. observes that ''nowhere else does it serve as a basin for washing a child at birth'', but Pindar seems deliberately to have kept the word which in the traditional story denoted the cauldron used for Pelops' revivification, so that his change might seem to consist in the

mere modification of the meaning of a word. Cf. also Howie, 288, and his reference (n. 89) to the literature on Pindaric ambiguity. He also compares the revision of myths practised by Palaephatus.

26: Κλωθώ. Introduced to show that this was Pelops' natural birth, not a rebirth (Ge.): cf. Köhnken, *Time*, 70-1. For Clotho as a goddess of birth cf. also Howie, 285 and n. 65, who further points out (286) that the mention of the goddess resolves the ambiguous meaning of λέβητος (cooking-cauldron and washing-vessel) in favour of the latter sense. He also observes (*ibid.*) that "the mention of a Fate as present at the hero's birth points to his great destiny": cf. *O.* 6, 42 and *O.* 10, 52.

27: ἐλέφαντι. Ge. lists a number of explanations, the most obvious of which seems to be H. L. Lorimer's suggestion that "the gods, suddenly called on to find a spare part, can produce it only in their own substance". Pindar retains this detail in order to reinforce the impression that his story refers to the same facts as the traditional story: cf. Köhnken, *Time*, 69 n. 12, 70-1, who compares *P.* 3, 27-30 as "an undisputed example of this technique of presenting a new story in terms of the old". Howie's suggestion (287) that the word is perhaps ambiguous, alluding to the whiteness of the skin or to a white birth-mark seems to me less convincing. For the motif of heroes born with a special sign cf. Howie, 286 and n. 72, who also refers (287 and nn. 74-77) to Pelops' shoulderblade recovered from the sea and preserved at Olympia.

27: κεκαδμένον. Ge. writes: "Whether Pindar intended the Homeric meaning 'distinguished' or the later meaning 'furnished' cannot be determined, although the presence of the Homeric phrase φαίδιμον ὦμον perhaps supports the former". But the Homeric καίνυμαι always implies the notion of surpassing others, which is hardly relevant here. Ge. further writes that "the frequent use of the dative in Homer with this verb indicates that ἐλέφαντι is governed by the participle rather than the adjective", but this conclusion is rather supported by the fact that κεκαδμένος in the sense of 'furnished with' is commonly construed with a dative.

28: θαύματα. Pindar sincerely believes in the possibility of divine miracles: cf. *P.* 10, 48-50 ἐμοὶ δὲ θαυμάσαι/θεῶν τελεσάντων οὐδέν ποτε φαίνεται/ἔμμεν ἄπιστον, *Pae*, 9, 1 ff., fr. 108 b.

28: καί. Rightly taken by Ge. in an adversative sense. See further my note on Hes. *Op.* 519, Mnem. IV 33 (1980), 385, and the literature mentioned there.

28: πού τι. Ge. takes τι ('to some extent') with ἐξαπατῶντι, but it more probably reinforces που: cf. *P.* 4, 87, *I.* 2, 24, LSJ τις A 11 c. Similarly πάνυ τι, σχεδόν τι, etc.

28: που. Is used "in Behauptungen von deren Richtigkeit man überzeugt ist, die man aber nicht beweisen kann" (Wackernagel I, 700-

4). It depends on the context whether certainty or reserve predominates. In the present passage the former is the case: 'no doubt'. Denn.'s explanation (491), "που is used ironically, with assumed diffidence, by a speaker who is quite sure of his ground", is not correct: the combination of certainty and reserve is based on the same indefiniteness that makes τις, ποτε, πως either weaken or strengthen the idea to which they are attached: cf. K.G. I, 663-4, Schw. II, 579-80, Fraenkel on A. *Ag.* 182.

28: καί. Belongs to the whole sentence: 'it also happens that' (Ge.'s alternative, "the second καί may simply emphasize βροτῶν", is unlikely): cf. *P.* 1, 35, *I.* 2, 23, and my observations in Mnem. IV 29 (1976), 181.

28b: φάτις. Explained by Ge. "as being in apposition to μῦθοι", but he refers to Bruhn, § 12, for "a plural in apposition to a singular". Accordingly, Wil. (235 n. 1) seems to be right in saying that μῦθοι stands in apposition to φάτις and that the number of the verb is assimilated to the apposition[35]. A similar, but converse, case is Aeschin. 3, 133 Θῆβαι, πόλις ... ἀνήρπασται. The assimilation more frequently occurs in predicative constructions: see note on *O.* 11, 6 τέλλεται.

S. L. Radt, Gnom. 46 (1974), 116 n. 0, argues that δεδαιδαλμένοι μῦθοι cannot refer to common talk. He suggests to take φάτις as a plural accusative depending on ἐξαπατῶντι. But the common people, rather than their talk, are deceived. The common talk is the effect of the deceptive tales of the poets, so that the apposition may be said to have explanatory (motivating) force: see my notes on E. *Ba.* 10, Mnem. IV 33 (1980), 3, and A. *Suppl.* 85, Mnem. IV 38 (1985), 297[36]. It might still be objected that common talk is not 'cunningly wrought', but quotations from the tales of the poets may have found their way into the popular version of the story, and this explains the fact that the latter, too, is deceptive.

28b: ὑπέρ. It is misleading to say (Hubbard, 103) that "the myth is declared 'false' ": Pindar uses 'beyond' instead of 'against' in order to suggest that his dissenting view (36 ἀντία) does not completely contradict the traditional story, but returns to its true kernel, the fancies of others having gone too far. Similarly *N.* 7, 20-1 πλέονα ... λόγον. Pindar shared the common view that the mythical past is a true reality: see note on *O.* 10, 24 ὄν. This explains the fact that he used all kinds of subtleties to make his deviations from the traditional tales appear as small as possible: see above, on 26 λέβητος, 27 ἐλέφαντι, and below on 32 πολλάκις, 43 δευτέρῳ, 46 ματρί, 47 κρυφᾷ, 48-51, 52 ἄπορα, 53 κακαγόρους.

---

[35] Sitzler wrongly takes φάτις as a plural and reads δεδαιδαλμένῳ ... μύθῳ.

[36] Köhnken's proposal (*Time*, 76 n. 45) to put a full stop after φάτις and to assume an explanatory asyndeton produces a sentence which is hardly intelligible.

28b: ἀλαθῆ. For truth as a principle of Pindar's art cf. my remarks in Mnem. IV 36 (1983), 28-9. Hubbard (104) argues that Pindar's proclamations of truth "are better taken as assertions of sincerity than of historical accuracy. Even while fictional and 'false' on the realistic level of the signified, there may be a higher and more essential level on which the signifiers are 'true' inasmuch as they are appropriate and self-consistent. Pindar's is a poetic truth, not an historical truth". It may be answered (1) that the distinction between signifier and signified is an anachronism inspired by modern idealism, and (2) that Pindar did not separate the mythical past from the historical past (see preceding note).

28b: λόγον. 'Account' may be correct, but 'the true facts' (Jur. 'den wahren Sachverhalt') seems a more natural translation: cf. Hdt. I 111, 5 πυνθάνομαι τὸν πάντα λόγον, LSJ VIII 1. For the transition from 'tale' to 'subject-matter' see also Ge.'s note on 8 ὕμνος[37].

29: δεδαιδαλμένοι. Ge. refers to F. Frontisi-Ducroux, *Dédale. Mythologie de l'artisan en Grèce ancienne* (Paris 1975), 29-82, but see also the critical remarks made by H. Koenigs-Philipp, Gnom. 51 (1979), 42-5, who concludes (43) that Frontisi's analysis "lässt das Wort δαίδαλος und seine Ableitungen in einem rhetorischen Wortmystizismus aufgehen".

29: ψεύδεσι. Does not necessarily imply intention: cf. Luther, 83-4. Similarly *N.* 7, 22 ψεύδεσι.

29: ποικίλοις. In addition to the literature mentioned by Ge. cf. my remarks in Mnem. IV 36 (1983), 17-8, and my note on *O.* 3, 8 ποικιλόγαρυν. Hubbard (101) is certainly wrong in concluding from the fact that ποικιλία also characterizes Pindar's own work that the latter "nests the possibility of deceit".

29: ἐξαπατῶντι. Ge. rightly defends the absolute use of the verb: cf. also the parallels given by Fenn. and my note on Hes. *Op.* 1 κλείουσαι. For the intensifying force of ἐκ- cf. my note on Hes. *Op.* 48 ἐξαπάτησε.

29: μῦθοι. Rightly taken by Ge. in a pejorative sense: cf. LSJ II 2, and H. Hofmann, *Mythos und Komödie* (Hildesheim 1976), 41-3, who points out that in μῦθος the subjective aspect, i.e. the activity of the story-teller, is more prominent than in λόγος. See also W. Rösler, *Die Entdeckung der Fiktionalität in der Antike*, Poetica 12 (1980), 283-319, espec. 297-8 n. 37.

30: Χάρις. 'Charm' is an indispensable but ambivalent element in poetry: cf. my remarks in Mnem. IV 36 (1983), 29 and 48. See further the introduction to my commentary on *O.* 14[38].

---

[37] Th. Horovitz, *Vom Logos zur Analogie* (Zurich 1978), 77, rightly translates 'wahrer Sachverhalt', but does not explain the transition.

[38] Segal's suggestion (221, 225) that χάρις is "the positive aspect of man's recognizing his mortal limitations", "as the successful communication between God and man", is an unwarranted generalization.

30: δέ. Has explanatory (motivating) force: cf. Denn., 169-70. Similarly *N.* 7, 23 σοφία δέ.

30: μείλιχα. It is misleading to say that "τὰ μείλιχα has a derogatory connotation" (Ge.): μείλιχος is 'winning a person over to one's side', and this may be the wrong side, as it is in v. 31.

31: ἐπιφέροισι. Ge. adopts Köhnken's explanation (*Mythos*, 53 n. 87) of ἐπι- as denoting an addition. But the more probable meaning is 'conferring on': cf. LSJ I 4.

31: τιμάν. Ge. rightly argues that we should not supply θνατοῖς, but μύθοις. But in that case τιμή does not mean 'honour' but 'value', 'distinction': cf. LSJ II 1. Similarly *P.* 4, 278 ἄγγελον ἐσλὸν ἔφα τιμὰν μεγίσταν πράγματι παντὶ φέρειν. Fenn.'s 'by adding her authority'[39] is obviously wrong.

31: ἄπιστον. For the neuter singular of an adjective used as a substantive cf. my note on Hes. *Op.* 71 ἴκελον.

31: ἐμήσατο. 'Contrives', but virtually equivalent to 'makes': for the fact that the archaic Greeks did not draw a sharp distinction between a plan and its execution cf. my remarks in Lampas 5 (1972), 105, and my note on Hes. *Op.* 49 ἐμήσατο. See also below, on 106 μήδεται.

32: πολλάκις. Ge. observes that this can equally well imply qualification as intensification. The latter seems to me more likely in the present context: when poetic deception occurs frequently, the case of Pelops is no exception, so that Pindar's correction does not seem exceptional either.

33-4. Ge. gives parallels and references to modern literature. It should be added that Pindar could emphasize the reliability of Time as a witness more strongly than other authors because he considered Time to be an active and universal power which brings everything to fulfilment: cf. Gund., 129-30, Vilj., 147 n. 12, Fränkel, *W.u.F.*, 10-2. See also notes on *O.* 10, 7 and 53.

34: σοφώτατοι. Pindar uses σοφός instead of σαφής, not because he "wished to incorporate in the same sentence the ideas of time as witness to the truth and of the wise poet as witness to the truth" (Ge.), for Time equally judges the 'idle stories' of other poets and the purified version proposed by Pindar, and it can do so because as a universal power (see preceding note) it is a 'competent' (see above, on 9 σοφῶν) witness of every claim to truth.

35: ἔστι. I do not believe that the position of the word makes it emphatic, as is assumed by Fenn. and Ge. Similarly *O.* 11, 1 ἔστιν.

35: δέ. Introduces a second reason why one should avoid telling lies about the gods, the first reason being that Time will expose such lies.

---

[39] Similarly Jur. 'ihre Weihe', Bremer (above, n. 33), 304 'ihre wirkende Geltung'.

35: **δαιμόνων.** Strohm (48-9) rightly observes that Pindar uses δαίμονες instead of θεοί "wenn er ... den Gedanken an bestimmte Gestalten zurückdrängen will; die Überwelt schlechthin wird so bezeichnet ... und zwar fast überall scharf abgehoben gegen das Sterbliche".

35: **καλά.** Ge. argues that "the idea that it is seemly to speak well of the gods is similar to the statement often made by Pindar that it is seemly to praise the victor's accomplishments or the deity who is deemed to have provided the victor with assistance. All of these perform an encomiastic function", because "it is in keeping with the aims of encomiastic poetry that what is καλόν should be revealed". But to speak well of the gods is a religious principle which has nothing to do with the practice of praising men or gods. Pindar's moral motivation (52) is not "a poetical pretence, by which Pindar 'morally' justifies the radical change of a well-known myth to make it suitable for Hieron's Olympic victory" (Köhnken, 106), but a sincerely felt belief: the strong language of 52 (and still more of *O.* 9, 35 ff.) shows "dass weniger die Liebe zur Gottheit als die Furcht hier als Triebkraft erscheint" (H. Fränkel, Ant. 3 (1927), 53-4).

35: **μείων.** Ge. writes that Pindar "presumably means that the risk of incurring blame is less, and the implication seems to be that such a risk is always present whenever one says anything about the gods"[40]. But there do not seem to be parallels in Pindar for the belief that it is always risky to say something about the gods[41]. Consequently, 'less' is an urbane expression for 'non-existent': cf. *P.* 1, 82 μείων ἕπεται μῶμος ἀνθρώπων, Xen. *An.* VII 6, 4 χεῖρόν ἐστιν αὐτῷ ('bad'), K.G. II, 306-7, Schw. II, 184. For the mild litotes cf. also Race, 106.

36: **δέ.** For δέ after an apostrophe (similarly *O.* 6, 12, *O.* 8, 15, *P.* 10, 10) see my note on Hes. *Op.* 27, where I have argued that it should be explained as a weak form of δή[42].

36: **προτέρων.** For earlier versions of the myth cf. Howie, 278 ff.

36: **φθέγξομαι.** Ge. refers to Bundy I, 21-2 for the use of the future as "a conventional element of the enkomiastic style", but he does not explain it. The future is originally used in such cases in which the speaker's mind is dominated by the fact that the object or the result of his action lies in the future (e.g. Hom. A 181 ἀπειλήσω δέ τοι ὧδε), but it then becomes an expression of urbanity: cf. K.G. I, 172-3, Schw. II, 290-1; see also my note on *O.* 7, 20 ἐθελήσω. That this use is not

---

[40] Similarly Jur.: "auch wenn sein eigener Bericht gleichfalls unwahr ist".

[41] Burz.'s suggestion that "Pindaro risentirebbe della concezione orfica, secondo cui qualunque discorso sulla divinità è tabú" is an arbitrary idea.

[42] Fenn. wrongly compares the use of ἀλλά after a vocative: see above, on 17 ἀλλά.

specifically 'encomiastic' has been shown by Fogelmark, 93 ff.[43]. I doubt, however, whether he is right in concluding (96) that "as the reference to the future implies that the praise never ceases but goes on for ever and ever, it also carries the idea of the final, enduring judgement". It should rather be called desiderative.

37: ἐκάλεσε. Köhnken (*Time*, 71 n. 29) argues that "in an ode designed for oral performance the grammatically indispensable term of reference is much more likely to be found in what has already been said and heard (36 υἱὲ Ταντάλου, σέ) than to be supplied from a syntactically different clause yet to come (39 ἀμοιβαῖα θεοῖσι δεῖπνα παρέχων)". But Ge. is undoubtedly right in observing that "the emphasis here is on the nature of the feast and on Tantalus' friendly relations with the gods, not on Tantalus' having invited his own son to his feast". It should be borne in mind that in Greek context is often more important than word order: cf. Xen. *An.* I 8, 11 καλέσας παρεκελεύετο τοῖς Ἕλλησι, K.G. II, 561-3.

37: τόν. Ge. thinks that the article combining with the superlative serves "to emphasize the different version he is giving" (similarly Sitzler), but does not give parallels for such a use of the article. It more probably means 'that feast which I have announced to tell', an announcement implied in 36 καλά: for the anaphoric use of the article see note on *O.* 10, 56 τάν. Köhnken's translation (*Time*, 76 n. 47) 'that famous' seems to me to over-emphasize Pindar's innovation.

37: εὐνομώτατον. Well explained by Ge.[44] He refers to Hdt. I 162 ἀνόμῳ τραπέζῃ as a contrasting parallel: cf. also A. *Ag.* 151 θυσίαν ἄνομον.

38: φίλαν. Ge. argues that "the surface meaning is probably 'dear (to Tantalus)' ", and "that a second meaning 'dear (to the gods)' is also intended". The latter, however, seems to be the only meaning intended: as a mortal king Tantalus would not give a party on the top of a mountain, but he chooses a place dear to his divine guests.

Ge. further thinks that there is a parallel between φίλαν Σίπυλον and 16-7 φίλαν τράπεζαν (similarly Fenn.), but the meaning of φίλος is quite different in the two passages.

38: τε. The examples of single τε given by Denn. (497) suggest that it expresses a close connection between two words. Accordingly, v. 38 is a kind of *hendiadyoin* (Fenn.): 'a banquet on their beloved Sipylus'.

40: τότε. For erotic behaviour towards boys at feasts cf. Howie, 292 and nn. 114-6.

---

[43] W. J. Slater, *Futures in Pindar*, CQ 19 (1969), 86-94, concludes (88): "Pindar formulates his song by convention roughly for a time when his chorus is arriving at the place where they are to sing". This view has been rightly combated by Fogelmark, 99 ff.

[44] Although he is wrong in adopting Slater's assumption of a contrast between Tantalus' behaviour at 61 and Hiero's symposia: see below, on 58 εὐφροσύνας.

41: φρένας. For φρένες as the seat of emotions cf. Onians, 37-8.

41: ἱμέρῳ. Wil. (236) shuddered at the thought that pederasty practised by the gods was considered καλόν (35) by Pindar. That it was morally accepted by the poet and probably practised by himself also appears from *O.* 10, 99 and 109-10, *N.* 8, 1-2, fr. 123, fr. 128. See further E. L. de Kock, Acta Class. 5 (1962), 28 ff., B. Gentili, Stud. Urbin. 39 (1965), 83 ff.[45].

41: χρυσέαισί τε. Rightly defended by Ge. It may be added that τε introduces a specification: cf. Denn., 502 (e), and see my note on *O.* 14, 2. Similarly *O.* 10, 11, *O.* 11, 19, *N.* 11, 45.

41: χρυσέαισι. For gold as characteristic of the possessions of the gods Ge. refers to Richardson on *H. Dem.* 19 and Page on Sappho 1, 8. Cf. also Duchemin, 223 ff., who points out that it is a symbol of radiance and imperishableness. See further above, on 1 χρυσός, and my notes on *O.* 3, 19 χρυσάρματος and *I.* 2, 1 χρυσαμπύκων.

42: ὕπατον. Ge. rightly observes that "ὕπατος is a common epithet and cult-title of Zeus", but it should be added that the word in this context does not mean 'highest', but rather 'highly situated', 'in the sky': similarly A. *Ag.* 55 and 89. See further note on *N.* 11, 2 ὑψίστου.

42: εὐρυτίμου. For εὐρύς 'widely extending' cf. Hom. A 102 εὐρὺ κρείων, κ 344 κλέος εὐρύ, and my notes on E. *Ba.* 87 εὐρυχόρους, Mnem. IV 34 (1981), 303, and Hes. *Op.* 197 εὐρυοδείης.

42: δῶμα Διός. Equivalent to Olympus, just as at Hom. A 221-2 ἡ δ' Οὔλυμπόνδε βεβήκει/δώματ' ἐς αἰγιόχοιο Διὸς μετὰ δαίμονας ἄλλους, A 570 ὤχθησαν δ' ἀνὰ δῶμα Διὸς θεοί (cf. 494 πρὸς Ὄλυμπον, but at 535 Zeus goes ἐὸν πρὸς δῶμα), E 398 πρὸς δῶμα Διὸς καὶ μακρὸν Ὄλυμπον.

Ge. argues that "Pindar clearly wishes to draw an analogy between Pelops and Ganymedes and since it was Διὸς κατὰ δῶμα (*HAph* 204) that Ganymedes served as cupbearer, Pelops is carried off to the same place". But Ge. himself observes that at *H.Aphr.* 204 Ganymedes is cupbearer θεοῖς. This phrase and 203 ἵν' ἀθανάτοισι μετείη show that at *H.Aphr.* 204, too, Διὸς δῶμα is not the private palace of Zeus but the general building where the gods hold their meetings.

Ge. further suggests that "at the same time mention of Zeus (cf. 10 and 111) helps us to remind that Hieron, Pelops' analogue, owed his victory to Zeus, the patron deity of the Olympic games" (similarly Köhnken, 204), but this is a far-fetched association.

---

[45] P. Von der Mühll, *Ausgewählte kleine Schriften* (Basel 1975), 235 ff., seems to me wrong in adopting Welcker's suggestion that such erotic poems as fr. 123 were a mere social fashion: cf. B. A. van Groningen, *Pindare au banquet* (Leiden 1960), 81. For *I.* 2, 3 παιδείους see my note *ad loc.*

43: δευτέρῳ. Ge. rightly observes that "by adding such a familiar parallel Pindar helps to win belief for his new version of the Pelops myth": for Zeus' affair with Ganymedes as the 'model' of pederasty cf. Ge. on 45 χρέος and Howie, 293 and nn. 122-3. Ge. adds the remark that "Pelops is therefore indirectly praised by the comparison with Ganymedes", but it is more important to observe that by making Ganymedes follow the example of Pelops Pindar reinforces the illusion that his version of the story is the original one. This explanation seems to me more plausible than Howie's remark (293) that "Poseidon's action would thus be completely unprecedented, so that it was all the easier for the wrong conclusion to be drawn when Pelops vanished from a feast".

45: Ζηνί. For ἔρχομαι with dative of interest cf. LSJ A III 3 and B 1.

45: χρέος. Ge. compares Archil. Pap.Col. 7511, 10 τὸ θεῖον χρῆμα, but this is irrelevant, for χρέος simply means 'task', 'service' (LSJ IV).

46-7. For the fact that Pindar, after having called a traditional myth a lie, tries to show the liar's motive Howie (293-4) quotes parallels from Hecataeus, Herodotus, and Euripides.

46: ἄφαντος. For disappearance as a common motif in myths involving a man's transference to a higher status but wrongly interpreted by his surroundings Howie (294-5) gives parallels from Palaephatus and Heraclitus.

46: ματρί. Ge. observes that "it is maternal concern which is commonly emphasized in similar contexts", but it is more important to bear in mind that Tantalus had been present at the banquet and was a *habitué* on Olympus, so that he must have known what had passed. By ignoring the father Pindar reinforces the apparent truth of his story.

46: φῶτες. An archaism for ἄνδρες. Thummer in his note on *I.* 2, 1 writes: "Während ἀνήρ die allgemeine Bezeichnung für Mann, Mensch ist, meint das Wort φώς bei Pindar vornehmlich den grossen Menschen, der im Schutze der Götter bedeutende Taten vollbringt" (similarly Priv. on *I.* 2, 1). But the first example quoted by him is *O.* 1, 81 ἄναλκιν φῶτα (!). Cf. also Hom. δ 247-8 φωτὶ ... δέκτῃ, ζ 187 οὔτε κακῷ οὔτ' ἄφρονι φωτὶ ἔοικας, A. *Ag.* 398 φῶτ' ἄδικον. Even if the word originally meant 'prominent man', it distinguishes itself from ἀνήρ mainly by its archaic ring"[46].

47: κρυφᾷ. Ge. observes that "secretiveness is elsewhere a characteristic of the envious". It may be added that the word also suggests that the traditional story cannot claim official authority, since it originated from mere gossip.

---

[46] It appears from Hom. θ 217-8 that it was sometimes used merely for the sake of variation.

47: φθονερῶν. For envy as a motive for spreading a lie Ge. compares *P.* 11, 28-9. Cf. als Howie, 294, who compares A. *Ag.* 449-51. His suggestion (295) that "unfamiliarity with pederasty makes Pelops' disappearance from a feast hard to explain" seems to me less convincing: the neighbours' envy may indeed have arisen from the suspicion that Pelops had been picked out by one of the gods for erotic purposes.

48-51. Ge. maintains: "The fact that Pindar proceeds to describe the dismemberment in such vivid detail suggests that religious scruples were not a significant reason for his rejection of the traditional version ... The main reason for the new version was to enable Pelops to become a more suitable *exemplum* for an Olympic victor" (similarly Thummer, 112). This is not a conclusive argument, for the purpose of the detailed description may well be (1) to justify the harsh denunciation γαστρίμαργον[47], and (2) to show that the corrected version pertains to the very same story as the traditional one (see also above, on 27 ἐλέφαντι). A third, and perhaps more important, reason lies in the fact that the Greeks felt a kind of respect for traditional stories and common opinions, even if these conflicted with their own views. Herodotus, for instance, says (VII 152, 3): 'I am obliged (ὀφείλω) to tell what is told, but to believe it I am by no means bound'[48].

48: ὕδατος. Ge. writes: "The presence of both water and fire in the same verse makes us think of the same combination in v.1, nor does the reminiscence seem to be fortuitous ... The effect of this reminiscence is to sharpen the contrast between Hieron and Tantalus, the mythical *exemplum* which, like that of Ixion in *P.* 2, serves as an illustration of the victor's opposite". Such ideas will only appeal to those critics who are obsessed by the presupposition that unity is the key to a correct understanding of Pindar's art. The argument that "fire could have been omitted without causing any obscurity or ambiguity" is unconvincing, for the

---

[47] Ge. himself points out that the vagueness of the subject of 49 τάμον and 51 φάγον may be intended to intensify the horror of the traditional story. Howie (296) goes too far in concluding from 49 τάμον that "the gods deliberately killed Pelops". Cf. also H. Schmitz, *Hypsos und Bios* (Bern 1970), 38.

[48] See further my article *Respect for, and Criticism of, Current Views in Greek Thought*, Maia 15 (1963), 120-6. Cf. also J. A. Davison, *From Archilochos to Pindar* (London 1968), 304, who points out that Pindar "is a devout believer, and his method, as has been shown by Dr. Macan (ProcCA xxviii (1931), 44-63), is rather that of the historian—when the evidence fails to square with his religious convictions, he may bowdlerize it, but he feels bound to warn the reader that he has done so". For a general comparison of Pindar and Herodotus cf. C. G. Starr, *Essays on Ancient History* (Leiden 1979), 393 ff.

Hubbard (158 n. 95) suggests that the detailed description of the dismemberment of Pelops serves to present Tantalus "as a negative paradigm of hospitality", but in the present context Pindar takes offence at the behaviour of the gods (52) rather than at that of Tantalus.

phrase πυρὶ ζέοισαν seems to be a reminiscence of Hom. Φ 362 ὡς δὲ λέβης ζεῖ ἔνδον, ἐπειγόμενος πυρὶ πολλῷ.

48: ζέοισαν. Ge. rightly remarks that the term 'enallage' should be avoided in such cases as the present one, where the words form a closely connected whole: cf. *O.* 2, 63 χερὸς ἀκμᾷ, *N.* 3, 39 ἀκμὰν φρενῶν, *I.* 8, 37 ἀκμὰν ποδῶν, and see also my note on *O.* 12, 13 τεά.

49: μαχαίρᾳ. Ge. observes that this "is also a technical term for a sacrificial knife (see LSJ) and Pindar may have added this detail in order to show that the traditional version represented the killing of Pelops as a formal sacrifice". But the envious neighbour who invented the story is more likely to have made it as cruel as possible. For μάχαιρα 'butcher-knife' cf. G. Berthiaume, *Les rôles du mágeiros* (Leiden-Montréal 1982), 109-10 n. 14.

49: κατά. Ge. rightly argues that this goes with μέλη and that the object σε is to be supplied from 51 σέθεν. Similarly at 37 θεούς is to be supplied from 39 θεοῖσι. See also my notes on Hes. *Op.* 47, 209, 215.

50: ἀμφί. Rightly taken by Ge. to belong with δεύτατα. For ἀμφί 'during' he compares 97 and *O.* 2, 30: see further LSJ C II. For τραπέζαισι 'at table' as a dative denoting an occasion cf. *O.* 10, 76 θαλίαις, *P.* 1, 47 μάχαις, *N.* 5, 5 Νεμείοις, *I.* 3-4, 20 'Ισθμίοις, S. *Tr.* 268 δείπνοις, K.G. I, 445, and my notes on *N.* 11, 21 πάλᾳ and Hes. *Op.* 231 θαλίῃς. For 'table' equivalent to 'meal' cf. LSJ I 2. Similarly *N.* 11, 9, *I.* 2, 40. The word has an emphatic position at the beginning of the line marking the distinction between the preparation and the eating of the meal.

50: δεύτατα. Formed on the analogy of ὕστατος *et sim.*: cf. Schw. I, 595. Meat was served at the second course because it was considered a delicacy: cf. e.g. E. fr. 467, Xen. *An.* IV 5, 31 (see also Howie, 311 n. 139).

50: κρεῶν. For the partitive genitive used as object cf. K.G. I, 345, Schw. II, 103, E. Nachmanson, *Δράγμα: Festschrift M. P. Nilsson* (Lund 1939), 309 ff.

52: ἄπορα. Ge. observes that "the neuter plural in place of the singular is fairly common in poetry and some prose authors", but does not give an explanation. The origin of the idiom seems to lie in those cases where the adjective is used as a predicate (e.g. Hom. ρ 15 ἐμοὶ φίλ' ἀληθέα μυθήσασθαι; see further my note on Hes. *Op.* 306 φίλα) or as a substantive (e.g. ξ 489 οὐκέτι φυκτὰ πέλονται: 'ways of escape'), but we may also compare the use of ταῦτα for τοῦτο referring to a single object in its plurality of aspects: see note on *I.* 2, 47.

It is significant that Pindar does not say 'I refuse', but 'I am unable', just as he does not say 'I reject', but 'I dissociate myself' (ἀφίσταμαι): see above, on 48-51.

52: τινα. I do not believe that the singular especially alludes to Demeter, as is suggested by Howie, 311 n. 145: in negative sentences τις usually means 'any one'.

52: ἀφίσταμαι. Ge. points out that this is equivalent to Pindar's custom of saying that compromising qualities of gods and heroes should be passed over in silence, but he wrongly concludes "that the thought is largely conventional and not an indication of Pindar's deep religiosity"[49]: the poet's general belief in καιρός as 'due measure' also comprises his religious conviction. Cf. also Gund., 47-8.

53: ἀκέρδεια. Sitzler rightly observes that the asyndeton has explanatory (motivating) force: cf. K.G. II, 344, and my note on Hes. *Op*. 211 and the literature mentioned there.

Howie (295) suggests that "the mention of 'ruin' (53) coupled with the earlier naming of Sipylus (38) as the location of the feast reminds the audience that traditionally the city of Sipylus was destroyed as part of Tantalus' punishment", and that in Pindar's revision of the myth "the destruction of Sipylus, we conclude, was due to the neighbour's blasphemy", but such a conclusion would be extremely far-fetched.

53: ἀκέρδεια λέλογχεν. Ge. observes that the normal relation between subject and object is reversed. He compares *O*. 10, 88 and *P*. 2, 27 (see also above, on 19 φροντίσιν and below, on 81 λαμβάνει), and argues that ἀκέρδεια is a semi-personification and should be capitalized, just as *O*. 10, 13 νέμει γὰρ Ἀτρέκεια πόλιν Λοκρῶν. It is true that "Pindar is very fond of such mild personifications" (Ge.), but it should be added that some of them, such as Πλοῦτος (*O*. 10, 88), Εἰρήνη (*O*. 13, 7), Αἰδώς (*N*. 9, 36), are no literary fictions but were worshipped as divine powers: cf. Ch. Picard, *Le théatre grec et l'allégorie*, REG 55 (1942), 25-49, espec. 32-3, 39-41, and see further my note on Hes. *Op*. 11 Ἐρίδων γένος. Farn. (467) gives a list of divine abstractions in Pindar, but the best explanation has been proposed by Strohm (22-3), who points out that human sentiments and achievements are considered by Pindar to be founded in the objective world. He refers e.g. to *I*. 6, 14 τοίαισιν ὀργαῖς ἀντιάσαις, *N*. 5, 42 Νίκας ἐν ἀγκώνεσσι πίτνων. Cf. also *O*. 6, 96-7 ἀδύλογοι δέ νιν/λύραι μολπαί τε γινώσκοντι, and see further my notes on *O*. 7, 24-5 ἀμφὶ ... κρέμανται and *N*. 11, 8 ἀσκεῖται θέμις. But these examples show that this objectivism borders on mannerism. This also applies to the use of λαγχάνω in such artificial constructions as *P*. 2, 27 τὰν Διὸς εὐναὶ λάχον.

53: κακαγόρους. Ge. compares *P*. 2, 52-6, where defamation is associated with hatred. Similarly Race, 107, who points out that "by

---

[49] W. J. Slater, CJ 72 (1977), 198 n. 26, even maintains that "the assumption ... that Pindar ... is motivated by deep religious feelings is surely just silly". The last words surely do not suit an article entitled 'Doubts about Pindaric Interpretation'.

eschewing the dangers of excessive blame, Pindar highlights *his* version of the myth''. They have failed to observe, however, the subtle way in which Pindar silently extends the envious calumniation of Pelops to a defamation of the gods, and thus creates the illusion as if the latter was inspired by similar hatred[50].

54: Ὀλύμπου σκοποί. Ge. argues that ''the ring-composition of v 64 indicates that Pindar chose the expression 'watchers of Olympus' because it was also capable of suggesting 'Olympian watchers' [thus Le.]. The gods watch over Olympus, but at the same time they watch over the deeds of men''. It is true that the genitive of a substantive can be used instead of an attributive adjective (cf. K.G. I, 264), but I doubt whether geographical substantives can be construed in this way. For σκοποί 'rulers' cf. *O.* 6, 59, *N.* 5, 27, *N.* 9, 5.

55: ἀλλὰ γάρ. Ge. does not answer the question whether an ellipse is involved: for a detailed discussion cf. E. S. Thompson, *The Meno of Plato* (London 1901), 264-9, who convincingly argues that γάρ was felt to introduce the unexpressed reason of what followed.

55: καταπέψαι. Gild. compares the figurative use of 'to stomach', but it should be added that the phrase καταπέψαι ὄλβον does not imply the notion of 'to keep down' or 'to submit to' (something unpleasant), but the idea of satisfaction. This is expressed by κατα-, which denotes the fact that the digestion is completed. Ge.'s note, ''metaphorical πέσσω is common, although the meaning is slightly different'', is not very helpful: the meaning 'to brood over' is based on the same idea of digestion, but here completion is missing. See also below, on 83 ἔφοι.

Ge. suggests ''that Pindar's choice of this verb was influenced by the preceding references to Tantalus' banquet''. It seems to me more correct to say that the metaphor links up with the idea of banquet implied in ἐτίμασαν. Ge. further wrongly thinks that the verb belongs to ''a broader theme that permeates much of the ode, namely the contrast between proper and improper behaviour at symposia'': I have already pointed out (above, p. 2) that a banquet is not identical with a symposium. I do not believe either that ''the Tantalos story is also designed to remind the proud victor of the limits and the transitoriness of his good luck'', as is maintained by Köhnken, 205 n.1. He thinks that 114 contrasts with the behaviour of Tantalus, but that line does not contain a warning against ἄτη (see below, note *ad loc.*).

[50] A. W. Miller, TAPA 111 (1981), 137-8, argues that at *P.* 2, 53 κακαγοριᾶν means 'speaking ill' in the sense of 'censure' or 'blame' rather than 'slander'. He adds the remark (n. 9) that ''if in *O.* 1.53 'slanderers' seems an appropriate rendering for κακαγόρους, that is only because piety dictates that any 'evil-speaking' against the gods is *ipso facto* false''. But the malice presupposed in 'slander' is not *ipso facto* implied in impiety.

56: κόρῳ. Ge. rightly translates, 'desire for excess, greed'[51], but his explanation, "active" as contrasted with a "passive" 'state of excess', is unsatisfactory, and the comparison with ὕβρις as meaning either 'arrogance' or 'brutality, violence' is misleading: in the case of κόρος a substantive is used in a desiderative sense, just as κέρδος 'pursuit of gain' (*P.* 3, 54, *N.* 9, 33, *N.* 11, 47, LSJ I 2).

57: ὑπέροπλον. Ge. observes that it here means 'exceedingly great', but elsewhere in Pindar 'insolent', and concludes that "Pindar may have chosen it here because in addition to describing the extent of Tantalus' ruin it could also suggest the conduct which caused the ruin". But the word can hardly mean 'caused by insolent conduct'. Ge. compares fr. 92 δεσμὸς ὑπερφίαλος, but the original meaning of ὑπερφίαλος seems to be 'puissant' without any bad sense (cf. LSJ). The quantitative use of ὑπέροπλος may have originated from such phrases as Hes. *Th.* 670 βίην ὑπέροπλον ἔχοντες.

57: ἄν. Ge. does not explain the construction[52]: ἄν is the predicate of the unexpressed internal object of κρέμασε[53]. See further my note on *O.* 7, 16 ἄποινα and the literature mentioned there.

57: τοι. Ge. rightly defends Fenn.'s emendation. It may be added that οἱ ... αὐτῷ cannot be accepted as a pleonasm because an emphatic pronoun[54] does not suit the context.

57: πατήρ. Ge. rightly takes this to mean πατὴρ ἀνδρῶν τε θεῶν τε (cf. Hom. Θ 69 etc.), but his argument, "it is unlikely that Pindar would want us to think of this relationship [Zeus as the father of Tantalus] in a context where Tantalus is the very antithesis of the victor", is unconvincing: see above, p. 2. Ge.'s second argument, "the preceding Ὀλύμπου σκοποί ... removes any ambiguity", is insufficient: Zeus is more likely to act as representing the gods (see above, on 42 δῶμα Διός) than as the father of Tantalus, for the latter's action does not affect him as Tantalus' father, but as the supreme god (cf. also 64 θεόν).

57b: καρτερόν. Sitzler argues that "αὐτῷ gehört enge zu καρτερὸν λίθον ... Damit soll die Gefahr für Tantalos nachdrücklich hervorgehoben werden", and Ge. suggests that αὐτῷ goes both with ὕπερ κρέμασε and καρτερόν, but even if καρτερόν carries the connotation of a strong weapon (cf. 112 καρτερώτατον βέλος), such strength does not imply hostility.

---

[51] According to Burz., καταπέψαι shows that 'satiety' is the predominant meaning, but 'he could not manage his satiety' can hardly imply a desire for more.

[52] His remark, "On the various forms of apposition in Greek see K.G. 1. 281-90", is not very helpful.

[53] Cf. Sitzler: " 'Als welche' = 'die darin bestand, dass' usw.".

[54] Cf. W. F. Bakker, *Pronomen abundans and Pronomen coniunctum* (Amsterdam 1974), espec. 12-3.

58: εὐφροσύνας. Not exclusively 'Freude am Mahle' (Sitzler). Ge. remarks that "as Bundy 1.2 points out, εὐφροσύνα in Pindar often refers to the 'drinking and merriment' of the 'victory revel' "[55], and concludes: "Tantalus' sympotic behaviour is the antithesis of the behaviour which we are to assume was typical of Hieron (compare vv 14-17)". This view has also been influenced by the speculations put forward by W. J. Slater, CJ 72 (1977), 200, who even suggests that Tantalus' lack of εὐφροσύνη implies that "he neither sings nor is sung of". The whole idea of 'sympotic' parallels between Hiero and Tantalus should be abandoned, for their roles are completely different: (1) Tantalus is a guest, Hiero a host, and (2) Tantalus steals food and drink from his hosts, Hiero furthers the artistic activities of his guests.

59: ἀπάλαμον. Not 'helpless' (Ge.), but πρὸς ὃν οὐκ ἔστι παλαμήσασθαι (schol.). See further my note on Hes. *Op.* 20. The word is taken predicatively by many translators, but this goes less well with 60 ὅτι. Ge. rightly observes that "Pindar is fond of piling up epithets without any connective between them": Fenn. compares 10-1 ἀφνεὰν ... μάχαιραν, *O.* 2, 82 ἄμαχον ἀστραβῆ.

59: βίον. Ge. adopts Tarditi's view that this is an accusative of duration (similarly Köhnken, 205-6 n.1), but (1) in that case we should have expected πάντα instead of τοῦτον, and (2) an accusative of duration with two heavily loaded adjectives would be very unusual. Consequently, the traditional view, that πόνον stands in apposition to βίον, should be maintained. Ge. thinks that "Tarditi might have strengthened his argument by drawing attention to vv 97-8 where λοιπὸν ἀμφὶ βίοτον balances βίον and ἔχει εὐδίαν balances ἔχει πόνον", but such a balance only exists if "Pindar intended us to see a contrast between the kind of life Tantalus and an athletic victor (Hieron) lead", and this assumption, as we have seen, is utterly unfounded[56].

60-3. I do not believe that this is intended to parallel the fact that "in the traditional crime he gives his (divine) guests the wrong food (Pelops' flesh) and tries to escape the gods' notice" (Howie, 297): in the present story the attempt to escape the gods' notice is not Tantalus' primary aim.

60: τέταρτον. Ge. rightly prefers Schroeder's explanation. Hom. A 128 deserves to be quoted: τριπλῇ τετραπλῇ τ' ἀποτείσομεν. Cf. also Ar.

---

[55] Bundy goes still further by maintaining that εὐφροσύνα "is a poetic word for a victory revel": in reality the word comprises all the joys (including that of a victory ode) resulting from a victory. See also my note on *O.* 14, 14 Εὐφροσύνα.

[56] In his note on 98 Ge. writes: "The identical position of ἔχει and the repetition βίον-βίοτον in which both nouns express duration of time [but see above, on 59 βίον], make this contrast virtually certain". It should once again be remarked that analogies between common words do not prove anything.

Ach. 2, *Pax* 1150, *Ran.* 915. It may be added that the climax implied in 'four' is based on its being an extra added to a 'round' number: cf. M. van der Valk, AC 53 (1984), 75, who rightly concludes: "Pindar wishes to show that the punishment is a severe one, because it even surpasses the important number three". See further below, on 79 τρεῖς τε καὶ δέκα.

60: κλέψαις. For the meanings of κλέπτω Ge. refers to Denniston's note on E. *El.* 364. Cf. also Luther, 105 ff.

61: ἀλίκεσσι. Does not imply "that Tantalus' companions are subject to the constraints of age", so that the word marks the contrast between men and gods (Ge.), but simply means 'companions': cf. *P.* 3, 17-8 ἅλικες ... ἑταῖραι, LSJ 2.

63: οἷσιν. Ge. rightly argues that this should not be emended to οἷς νιν (e.g. Tur.) or οἷς ἵν (Young), because the object is easily understood from the context. He compares *O.* 6, 53, *P.* 4, 34, *N.* 10, 61-2: see also above, on 49 κατά.

63: ἄφθιτον. Sitzler, who adopts Hartung's ἀφθίτους θῆκεν, objects to ἄφθιτον: "so hinkt der letzte Satz unerträglich nach und ist seinem Inhalt nach für den Zusammenhang entbehrlich". But (1) θῆκεν cannot be taken in a desiderative sense, and (2) after θῆκαν we have mentally to supply 'and by which he hoped to make his companions immortal'.

Fenn. (p. 3) wrongly argues that "throughout the whole ode ... there runs a subtly-veiled depreciation of long life": 82-3, 99-100, 113-4, to which he refers, do not imply such a depreciation either.

64: θῆκαν. Ge. "slightly" prefers θῆκαν to θέν νιν, but he has "no great confidence in either one" because "it seems unlikely that it would have been felt necessary to emend θῆκαν or even to have inserted a marginal gloss θέσαν which might later have replaced the original reading". But θέσαν is no emendation: it belongs to a marginal gloss θέσαν αὐτόν which was mistaken for a reading.

64: εἰ ... ἁμαρτάνει. Ge. writes: "The gnomic utterance is so framed as to remind us of the conditional sentence in vv 54-5" (at pp. XII-XIV he even speaks of 'ring-composition'). But (1) 54-5 can hardly be called a gnome, and (2) the meaning of εἰ is different in the two sentences.

64: θεόν. G. François, *Le polythéisme et l'emploi au singulier des mots θεός, δαίμων* (Paris 1957), 73, takes the singular to have a collective sense. In my review, Mnem. IV 17 (1964), 81-2, I have argued that in such cases the meaning is 'a god' (e.g. at 106) or 'the god in question' (in the present line Zeus). Cf. also F. Wehrli, *Λάθε βιώσας* (Leipzig 1931), 72, who observes that "bestimmte Umstände rufen den betreffenden nächststehenden Gott in Erinnerung". He refers to *O.* 13, 104-6, where θεῷ is followed by Δί. A different view (θεός = 'God') is defended by W. Pötscher, WS 71 (1958), 3 ff., espec. 19.

64: τι. Ge. observes that from a palaeographical point of view Mommsen's λελάθεμεν is equally good, but the latter's argument, "multo ... praestat omissio obiecti, ut ἔρδων sit quaecumque facit (*mit seinen Thaten*)", does not seem to me convincing: the context requires ἔρδων to have a pejorative sense, and this is effected if τι is taken as a euphemism for 'something bad': cf. Ar. *Ach.* 579, Thuc. V 20, 2 and Steup *ad loc.*, LSJ A II 3.

64: λαθέμεν. A future (λασέμεν Byz.) is not necessary because the present can have prospective force ('to continue escaping notice'): cf. K.G. I, 196-7, Schw. II, 296.

65: οἱ. Ge. writes: "οἱ as a possessive dative is common in Pindar". He refers to the parallels given by Wüst, 145, but οἱ can always be taken as a dative of interest, and in the present passage this is more likely on account of the word order. See also above, on 23 οἱ.

67: πρός. 'Towards the time of' (Ge.) is a misleading translation: πρός can be used in a temporal sense, but only in connection with temporal notions (e.g. *P.* 9, 25 πρὸς ἀῶ, *N.* 9, 44 πρὸς γῆρας), and φυά ('stature') is a corporeal, not a temporal, notion. The meaning therefore must be 'in accordance with': cf. *O.* 4, 5 ἔσαναν αὐτίκ' ἀγγελίαν ποτὶ γλυκεῖαν, *P.* 6, 45 πατρῷαν ... πρὸς στάθμον, LSJ C III 5.

68: μέλαν. Ge. writes that "the adjective is used proleptically". It seems more correct to say that the predicate has resultative force: see my notes on *O.* 3, 15 μνᾶμα and 18 στέφανον, *O.* 12, 2 εὐρυσθενέα. Similarly *O.* 10, 95 and *N.* 11, 5.

Segal's comment (215), "Even the youthful beauty of Pelops is shadowed by a grim suggestion of mortality in the phrase 'when the down darkened his black chin' ", is a typical case of hyper-interpretation: Ge. clearly shows that in this context the word does not have an emotional overtone.

68: γένειον. For the σχῆμα καθ' ὅλον καὶ μέρος Ge. refers to K.G. I, 289-90 and Schw. II, 81, but it should be added that the construction is a case of 'parathesis' (i.e., both objects directly depend on the verb): cf. B. A. van Groningen, *La parathèse grammaticale en grec*, Mnem. III 9 (1941), 258-80, espec. 274-5.

68: ἔρεφον. I do not believe that this is a reminiscence of Hom. Ω 450-1, as is suggested by Ge., who observes that the verb "elsewhere seems to be restricted to passages in which some word for 'crown' or 'wreath' is present": the beard may be imagined as a wreath surrounding the chin.

69: ἑτοῖμον. Rightly taken by Ge. to mean 'ready to hand', 'available'. He compares E. *Hel.* 1386, but there the meaning is 'at his disposal' rather than 'for which an opportunity offered itself': for the lat-

ter meaning cf. Thuc. I 20, 3 ἐπὶ τὰ ἑτοῖμα μᾶλλον τρέπονται, and ἐξ ἑτοίμου 'directly' (LSJ I 1). Pelops follows the principle of φρονεῖν τὸ παρχείμενον (*N.* 3, 75), and more especially of κατὰ καιρὸν ἐρώτων δρέπεσθαι (fr. 123, 1): he is not carried away by ἀπρόσικτοι ἔρωτες (*N.* 11, 48). For this doctrine of seizing the opportunity cf. Strohm, 72-5, espec. 72-3: "Der Sinn dieses 'Carpe diem' ist freilich von allem Hedonismus weit entfernt ... Nicht einer klugen Sicherung des Lebensgenusses dient diese Berufung auf den Augenblick, sondern sie stemmt sich gegen ein ungestümes Tatwollen, das immer wieder frevelnd die Gesetze des menschlichen Loses missachtet" (as well as against the slackness of letting the opportunity slip): accordingly, καιρός 'opportunity' is regarded by Pindar as a special aspect of καιρός 'right measure'. See further the literature mentioned in my note on *I.* 2, 22 κατὰ καιρόν.

69: ἀνεφρόντισεν. Not 'turned his thoughts to an opposite direction' (Fenn.), but 'thought over': cf. ἀνασκοπέω 'survey'.

70: εὔδοξον. Ge. compares *P.* 9, 106a, but omits to add that her renown referred to her beauty, as appears from *P.* 9, 108-9. Ge. further thinks that "Chistoni may be right in his suggestion that εὔδοξος refers not only to 'glorious' Hippodameia, but also to the glory which would accrue to anyone who succeeded in winning her as a bride", but although Pindar often uses adjectives with causative overtones (cf. my note on *O.* 7, 11 ζωθάλμιος), in the present case such an implication seems rather artificial.

71: ἐγγύς. It is not correct to say that the asyndeton "has a solemn effect" (Fenn.) or that it "effectively marks the beginning of Pelops' hazardous exploit" (Ge.; similarly Jur.)[57]: the asyndeton does not mark a beginning but a consequence: cf. K.G. II, 342-3, and my note on *O.* 3, 24 τούτων. Ge. compares *O.* 3, 17, but there the asyndeton has explanatory (specifying) force: see my note *ad loc.* Cf. also below, on 89 ἃ τέκε.

71: πολιᾶς. It is misleading to say that "πολιός is often essentially the equivalent of λευκός" (Ge.), for, as Ge. himself observes, it refers to "the whiteness caused by any disturbance of its surface" (in the present case the waves breaking on the shore). G. Reiter, *Die griechischen Bezeichnungen der Farben Weiss, Grau, und Braun* (Innsbruck 1962), 14-7, 54-63, has pointed out that generally πολιός is 'dull white' and λευκός 'shining white'. See also my note on *O.* 7, 61 πολιᾶς.

71: ἁλός. Segal (226) writes: "The sea perhaps refers back to the divine elementality of water in the first line of the poem ... Here, how-

[57] It is equally misleading to say that "both the beginning of Pelops' attempt to win the hand of Hippodameia and the result of their marriage, the birth of six sons, are framed by asyndeton (71 and 89)" (Ge., p. XIV).

ever ... its vastness, impenetrability, and indifference only set off the weakness and uncertainty of the youth beside it". But (1) 1 ὕδωρ is mentioned for its utility (see note on ἄριστον), not its divinity, and (2) the sea is called 'dull white', not 'vast', 'impenetrable', or 'indifferent'. Ge. quotes some Homeric passages "which illustrate that in moments of extreme need or anguish it was conventional for one to withdraw from the company of others and utter prayer or lamentation by the sea-shore". But the sea-shore is not a privileged place of prayer: Ge. himself admits that "sometimes, as here ..., the sea is especially appropriate because of the deities involved". In other cases it is chosen because it is the nearest or most convenient place of isolation. In the present case the main reason of the choice, of course, is the fact that Pelops wants to address Poseidon.

71: **ὄρφνᾳ.** Ge. observes that "night is the time most suitable for the practice of magic". But (1) the magic alluded to at 76 πέδασον does not take place at night, and (2) the parallel prayer described at *O.* 6, 58-61 is not concerned with magic. G. J. de Vries, *De zang der Sirenen* (^{2}Baarn-Amsterdam 1986), 49, writes that Pindar uses darkness "almost in the manner of romantic poets" (similarly Dorns., *P.S.*, 49), but the choice is more likely to be an entirely practical one: Pelops needs a personal encounter with Poseidon, and night offers the best opportunity for solitude (οἶος)[58].

72: **βαρύκτυπον.** For βαρυ- compounds in Pindar cf. Kaimio, 153-4, who points out that they have "the connotation of an awe-inspiring or terrifying effect".

73: **Εὐτρίαιναν.** Ge. notes that this "is commonly translated as 'god of the fair trident' *vel sim.*, but perhaps the prefix could denote the skill with which Poseidon wields his trident". The latter view is undoubtedly correct: in addition to *O.* 9, 111 εὔχειρα 'skilled with his hands' referred to by Ge. see my note on *O.* 3, 39 εὐίππων. Similarly *I.* 2, 17 εὐάρματον.

75: **μέν.** Rightly taken by Ge. to have emphatic force. For emphatic μέν (originally a weak form of μήν[59]) see further K.G. II, 140, Schw. II, 570, Denn., 360-1, and my notes on *O.* 7, 32 and 49, and Hes. *Op.* 111. Similarly *I.* 2, 37.

75: **φίλια δῶρα Κυπρίας.** Ge. writes that "there is uncertainty whether Pelops is referring to his love for Poseidon, to Poseidon's love for Pelops, or to a love mutually shared". After discussing the arguments

---

[58] Segal (226) argues that "this darkness ... represents also the symbolical darkness ... of Pelops' recognition of his mortality which becomes explicit in 82-84": as if 83 ἐν σκότῳ καθήμενος applied to all human beings! Segal's construction (214) of "a movement from the brightness of the sun (5-6) and the gods (40-41) to the darkness of Pelops' prayer (71, 83) back to the tempered, humanly receivable brightness of the hero (91, 91-4)" is no less arbitrary.

[59] Cf. M. Leumann, *Kleine Schriften* (Zurich 1959), 229 ff.

supporting these three possibilities he concludes: "Clearly decision is difficult and it may be that Pindar has consciously or unconsciously combined elements from some or all of the interpretations given above". The uncertainty arises, however, from the fact that no sufficient attention has been paid to the meaning of φίλια: φίλια δῶρα does not mean 'gifts of love', but 'friendly gifts', i.e. gifts given out of friendship (Howie, 308 n. 112, compares Xen. *Hiero* 1, 33 μετὰ μὲν φιλίας καὶ παρὰ βουλομένου) and these no doubt refer to the erotic (Κυπρίας) services rendered by Pelops to Poseidon. It is well-known that φιλία is maintained by reciprocation, and it is to this feeling that Pelops appeals.

75: **ἐς.** 'Leading towards', 'resulting in': cf. Thgn. 162 οἷς τὸ κακὸν δοκέον γίγνεται εἰς ἀγαθόν, E. *Heracl.* 350-1 (quoted by Ge.).

75: **χάριν.** Not '(count in my) favour' (Gild., Nis.), 'good' (Bo.), 'charme' (Pu.), '(a source of) joy and favour' (Segal, 222), '(fonte di) gioia' (Le.), but 'gratitude' (Farn., Dorns., Ge.), for that is what a φίλος expects from his φίλος after having rendered him a service: cf. J. C. Fraisse, *Φιλία. La notion d'amitié dans la philosophie antique* (Paris 1974), Index s.v. réciprocité. Similarly *O.* 10, 11-2 (see notes *ad loc.*), Thuc. III 37, 1 ἐς τὴν τῶν ξυμμάχων χάριν μαλακίζεσθαι[60].

76: **πέδασον.** Ge. adopts Kakridis' suggestion that this reflects the vocabulary used in *defixiones*, but he admits that "a metaphorical binding need not always imply the presence or influence of magic". It should be added that a god has no need of magic: just as Poseidon νῆα θοὴν ἐπέδησ' ἐνὶ πόντῳ (Hom. ν 168), he will be able to stop Oenomaus' spear by his own divine power. Ge. suggests that Pindar may have thought of Hom. Ψ 585 ἅρμα πεδῆσαι, but the poet is more likely to have in mind the power of the gods to make a spear swerve from its target (Υ 438-41).

78: **κράτει δὲ πέλασον.** Ge. writes: "obviously intended to remind us of v 22 ... Pelops' victory serves as a kind of prototype for Hieron's recent victory" (similarly Segal, 220). But the two victories have nothing in common[61]: see above, pp. 2-3. For the spatial expression see above, on 22 προσέμειξε.

79: **τρεῖς τε καὶ δέκα.** "Numbers which exceed a familiar 'round' number by one, e.g. 13 (12 + 1), are occasionally of importance, see O.

---

[60] Ge. rightly argues that "the meaning 'gratitude' presumably derives from the idea of 'gratification' ", but wrongly concludes "that Pelops is hoping that Poseidon still remembers the 'gratification' he once felt and that as a result he will show his 'gratitude' ": χάρις is not the gratitude felt, but the gratitude expressed in a reward, and this reward is gratifying to the person who rendered the first service.

Fenn. writes: "The words εἴ τι ... χαίρω echo εἴ τί ... τις ... χάρις, *v.* 18", but omits to explain what the echo is.

[61] Fenn. goes still further and suggests that Pelops' victory "throws a mythical aureole over the Olympian chariot-race" alluded to at 109-11. He even assumes that in ἐπί "there is an idea of purpose or usefulness involved".

Weinreich, *Triskaidekadische Studien* 1916; *RGVV* XVI.1" (*Oxf. Class. Dict.*, 742). See also above, on 60 τέταρτον. Segal (254-5 n. 18) thinks that the number 13 has a sinister connotation, but his parallels are not probative: Hom. E 387 (Ares) χαλκέῳ δ' ἐν κεράμῳ δέδετο τρισκαίδεκα μῆνας (390: but was liberated), K 495 τὸν (Rhesus) τρισκαιδέκατον μελιηδέα θυμὸν ἀπηύρα (but he was the commander), ι 195-6 αὐτὰρ ἐγὼ κρίνας ἑτάρων δυοκαίδεκ' ἀρίστους/βῆν (but he was the leader). See further Fraenkel on A. *Ag.* 1605 and M. van der Valk on Ar. *Ran.* 50, AC 53 (1984), 75.

80: ἀναβάλλεται. The present has desiderative (or conative) force: cf. K.G. I, 140, Schw. II, 258-9.

81: μέγας. Not only 'great peril', but 'the peril of high emprise' (Fenn.).

81: κίνδυνος. Ge. points out the importance attached by Pindar to courage taking risks, but it should be added that he does not preach recklessness: τόλμα should be combined with σύνεσις (*N.* 7, 59, fr. 231; cf. *I.* 3-4, 63-5). Cf. also Race, 103-4.

81: οὐ. Sitzler takes this to belong to ἄναλκιν, but in that case the connection with the next sentence becomes unclear[62].

Ge. draws attention to Pindar's "practice of concentrating on the type of conduct to be avoided rather than on that to be espoused". See now Race, espec. 103-4.

81: φῶτα. See above, on 46 φῶτες.

81: λαμβάνει. Gund. (118 n. 104) rightly points out that this is not equivalent to δέχεται (Rumpel, LSJ A II 2), but to αἱρεῖ: cf. *P.* 4, 71 and S. *Ph.* 436-7 quoted by Ge., who rightly observes that Pindar reverses (see above, on 53 ἀκέρδεια λέλογχεν) such phrases as Hdt. III 69, 2 κίνδυνον ἀναλαβέσθαι (cf. also Lys. 13, 6 καιρὸν εἰληφέναι).

83: σκότῳ. Ge thinks that "Pelops' rejection of an inglorious old age lived 'in darkness' is parallel to Hieron's acquisition of glory which 'shines forth' at Olympia (23)". But fame as light and obscurity as darkness are aspects of one and the same *topos* in Pindar (cf. *N.* 7, 12-3 ταὶ μεγάλαι γὰρ ἀλκαὶ / σκότον πολὺν ὕμνων ἔχοντι δεόμεναι, *N.* 4, 40, *Parth.* 104c, 9, fr. 228), and such a *topos* is not sufficiently specific to have structural significance.

83: καθήμενος. Ge. writes: "The alternatives remind us of Achilles who had the choice of dying young at Troy with κλέος ἄφθιτον or returning home and living on to old age without κλέος ἐσθλόν (Il. 9, 413-15)"[63].

---

[62] Ge. writes that οὐ goes with the verb "primarily", and misleadingly speaks of a litotes.

[63] Similarly F. Preisshofen, *Untersuchungen zur Darstellung des Greisenalters in der frühgriechischen Dichtung* (Wiesbaden 1977), 102 n. 307.

But avoidance of an inglorious old age is a *topos* of heroic behaviour (cf. e.g. Callin. 1, 14-6, Tyrt. 9 D. = 12. W., 39-42). T. Krischer, Graz.Beitr. 10 (1981), 72-3, compares καθήμενος with Hom. Σ 104 ἧμαι, and concludes that Pindar has used the Homeric description of Achilles' encounter with Thetis as his model. But Ge. points out that 'sitting idly' is a common connotation of the verb, and Krischer's other parallels are not specific enough either.

83: ἕψοι. Ge. writes that "Pindar may have used ἕψοι because he was thinking of the proverb λίθον ἕψεις ...", and he adds two other, still more far-fetched suggestions. The parallel *P.* 4, 186 τὰν ἀκίνδυνον παρὰ ματρὶ μένειν αἰῶνα πέσσοντα shows that the meaning is 'live on', 'use up'. For digestion as a form of cooking cf. LSJ πέσσω III 1, ἕψω 2.

84: καλῶν. Ge. writes: "Pelops clearly knows what is καλόν, just as Hieron is said to in v 104", but Pelops aspires to heroic deeds, whereas καλῶν at 104 refers to μουσική (see note *ad loc.*).

84: ἀλλά. Ge. follows Bundy in thinking that this "draws to our attention that the negative statements presented in these verses are now being dismissed" (similarly Sitzler: "ἀλλά verneint die Frage"). In reality, the particle has a wider function, marking the transition from preliminary considerations to a call to action: see above, on 17 ἀλλά.

84: οὗτος. Ge. thinks that "the use of the demonstrative makes this passage resemble those in which Pindar stresses that one should strive for what is near at hand". But in that case Pelops would have used ὅδε: οὗτος obviously refers back to 76-81.

84: ἄεθλος. Ge. argues that "the use of ἄεθλος helps to strengthen the analogy between Pelops and Hieron". But ὑποκείσεται (see below) shows that ἄεθλος means 'labour' (cf. *P.* 4, 165, *I.* 6, 48, and Hdt. I 126, 2 τὸν προκείμενον ἄεθλον) rather than 'contest'.

85: ὑποκείσεται. Ge. thinks that ὑποτίθημι is used in the sense of 'to hazard venture'. But the passive is more likely to belong to the middle (cf. K.G. I, 126) used in the sense of 'to propose to oneself as a task' (cf. LSJ III 1). In that case the future refers to the fact that the context belongs to the future (Jur.): cf. my note on *O.* 7, 20 ἐθελήσω.

85: πρᾶξιν. 'Accomplishment': cf. Becker, 52-5, and see my note on *O.* 12, 8 πράξιος. Ge., who scents ring-composition everywhere, thinks that the word echoes τέλος implied in 76 τέλλεται. But he himself observes that τέλλεται "seems to mean little more than 'exist' and hence serves as one of the many synonyms of γίγνεται or ἐστι". His suggestion that the overtones of magic and of the sexual act "would be appropriate in the context" is a mere fancy: Pelops thinks only of gaining a victory over Oenomaus.

85: φίλαν. Ge. thinks that φίλαν δίδοι "repeats" 75 φίλια δῶρα and speaks of a ring-composition[64], but φίλια means 'given by a φίλος' (see note *ad loc.*), whereas φίλαν means 'pleasing' (scil. me).

85: δίδοι. Ge. is not convinced by Bakker's interpretation of the present imperative as 'hortative', but he omits to mention the essential part of Bakker's argument: present imperatives are "directed to persons holding a certain office, of whom may be expected that at a sign they will immediately start performing the action so familiar to them": *op. cit.* (above, on 5 σκόπει), 111-2, where he compares the imperatives ἄειδε and ἔννεπε addressed by Homer to the Muse.

86: οὐδ' ἀκράντοις. For the negative expression cf. Race, 114 n. 51.

86: ἐφάψατο. Ge. observes that "the metaphorical use of verbs of touching is commoner in Pindar than in any other Greek poet (see Bowra, 226-7)". It is based on his predilection for verbs with a spatial connotation: see above, on 22 προσέμειξε.

87: ἔπεσι. The dative is used on the analogy of verbs of approaching: cf. K.G. I, 349. Similarly *P.* 4, 296 ἁσυχίᾳ θιγέμεν. Attempts to discover a difference of meaning between the use of the dative and that of the genitive (e.g. Fenn.) are unconvincing.

87: πτεροῖσιν. The dative is not instrumental (Ge.) but local, denoting the field to which a quality is limited. The two kinds of dative are confused by K.G. I, 317, 437-8, 440. See further my notes on Men. *Epitr.* 590, Mnem. IV 27 (1974), 39, Hes. *Op.* 120, 234, 314[65]. Similarly *O.* 10, 66 πάλᾳ, *N.* 11, 13 μορφᾷ and 41 πλούτῳ.

88: ἕλεν. Ge. rightly argues that the construction is no zeugma because "αἱρέω is often used to mean both 'kill' and 'take' ". He quotes Hom. Λ 328 ἑλέτην δίφρον τε καὶ ἀνέρε, but in the phrase ἕλεν ... παρθένον 'he took' does not mean 'he captured' but 'he got' (Sitzler 'er errang'): cf. Alc. 42, 7, LSJ A II 3.

Ge. suggests that "it is possible that Pindar intended ἕλεν to remind us of the same verb in v 56 and of ἔξελε in v 26", and he again thinks of ring-composition. It should be emphatically denied that such common words have structural significance.

89: ἃ τέκε. For the metrical anomaly cf. the parallels mentioned by Ge. in his note on 80 μναστῆρας. Ge. prefers Boehmer's emendation ἔτεκε because he thinks that the asyndeton marks the end of Pelops' adventure, just as it marked its beginning at 71 (ring-composition!). But just as at 71 (see above, note *ad loc.*), the asyndeton would have consecutive force,

---

[64] Similarly F. Cairns, Hermes 105 (1977), 130.

[65] Cf. also F. Egermann on Thuc. I 22, 2 ἀκριβείᾳ, Hist. 21 (1972), 594-5.

Pelops being the subject of ἔτεκε and σύνευνον involving sexual intercourse[66].

89: λαγέτας. Köhnken (*Time*, 75 n. 42) thinks that if we read ἔτεκε "the obvious conclusion" is to take λαγέτας as a nominative singular (similarly e.g. Rumpel). But if ἔτεκε "contributes to the encomiastic treatment of Pelops" (Ge.), it is more honourable to mention the fact that all his six sons obtained a leading position (cf. *O*. 7, 71-6) than that he was a 'leader' himself.

89: μεμαότας. Well defended by Ge., who rightly criticizes Forssman's defence of μεμαλότας[67]. He compares Hom. B 818 μεμαότες ἐγχείῃσι and writes: "Just as spears are the instruments by which the Trojans give evidence of their ardour, so here ἀρεταί are the instrument by which the sons of Pelops give evidence of their ardour". But they give evidence of their ardour, not by means of their spears and their ἀρεταί, but by the way in which they handle them. Ge. further compares *P*. 3, 32-3 μένει θυίοισαν and *O*. 9, 16 θάλλει δ' ἀρεταῖσιν. In all these phrases the dative denotes the field to which the action is limited: see above, on 87 πτεροῖσιν[68].

90: αἱμακουρίαις. Ge. compares σιτόκουρος, but in the case of a sacrifice the victim's throat, not its blood, is cut. Farn. more plausibly suggests a connection with νεώκορος and ζάκορος (cf. Lat. *curare*).

91: ἀγλααῖσι. Rightly taken by Ge. to mean 'splendid', 'magnificent': cf. *I*. 5, 30 θυσίαισι φαενναῖς. Segal (213) writes: "The brilliance (*aglaia*) of the god's trident in snatching up Pelops to Olympus (40) is the source of the 'brilliant' (*aglaai*) sacrifices in which he partakes", another case of hyper-interpretation: Ge. rightly points out that "Pindar is very fond of ἀγλαός": see also my note on *O*. 3, 6 ἀγλαόκωμον[69].

91: μέμικται. Ge. rightly takes the perfect to have resultative force, but it is misleading to say that "Pelops' worship is viewed as continuous from the time of his death to the present": the result is viewed as some-

---

66 Ge. compares *P*. 2, 42-9, where "the origin and description of the Centaurs are marked off by the asyndeton of vv 42 (birth of Kentauros) and 49 (gnome)". But the former asyndeton introduces the result of 39-40, the latter introduces the conclusion to be drawn from the whole story of Ixion. Ge. further compares A. *Pr*. 199 and 228, but both asyndeta have specifying force (cf. 197 τάδε, 227 σαφηνιῶ).

67 It should be added that Forssman's interpretation (70) of Hes. *Op*. 231 θαλίῃς δὲ μεμηλότα ἔργα νέμονται is not correct: the clause does not mean 'sie üben Tätigkeiten aus, die auf Feste gerichtet sind', but 'during feasts they enjoy the products on which they have bestowed care': see my commentary *ad loc*.

68 Fenn. already observed: "The constr. appears to be designedly parallel to πτεροῖσιν ἀκάμαντας, *v*. 87".

69 Segal (215-6) further calls Pelops' worship at Olympia a "rebirth" analogous to his "rebirth from the 'pure caldron' (26-27)", but in Pindar's version of the myth there is no rebirth of Pelops.

thing enduring, i.e. extending from the present into the future, as appears e.g. from S. *Tr.* 486-7 βούλου λόγους/ οὓς εἴποις ἐς τήνδ' ἐμπέδως εἰρηκέναι. See further K.G. I, 148-9, Schw. II, 263-4, Friis Johansen-Whittle on A. *Suppl.* 246. Cf. also A. C. Moorhouse, *The Syntax of Sophocles* (Leiden 1982), 199-200.

Ge. further argues that "the use of the same verb in v 22 in connection with Hieron contributes to the analogy Pindar intends us to see between Pelops and Hieron", but the repetition does not seem to be intentional in view of his predilection for the metaphorical use of terms of 'mixing': see above, on 22 προσέμειξε[70].

92: πόρῳ. Ge. hesitates between 'ford' and 'course', but the latter is supported by Hom. E 709 λίμνῃ κεκλιμένος Κηφισίδι. In that case 'Αλφεοῦ is an explanatory genitive: cf. LSJ πόρος I 3, Vilj., 186 n. 80. Similarly *O.* 10, 48 πόρον 'Αλφεοῦ. The dative πόρῳ has locative force because 'river' includes its banks: cf. Hom. Σ 520-1 ὅθι σφίσιν εἶκε λοχῆσαι,/ἐν ποταμῷ, ε 466, and my note on E. *Ba.* 532, Mnem. IV 15 (1962), 348.

92: 'Αλφεοῦ. Ge. thinks that "with the mention of the river Alpheus we are reminded of v 20 and thus the analogy between Pelops and Hieron continues", but Alpheus is a common indication of Olympia.

92: κλιθείς. Ge. adopts Van der Valk's suggestion that this has the overtone of 'reclining at a meal', "since it continues the analogy between Pelops and Hieron". But such an allusion is extremely unlikely in a context where κλιθείς is determined by a geographical notion[71]. Ge. further thinks that "the aorist participle stresses the beginning of the process, 'having been made to lie' ". But (1) the meaning is not passive (cf. LSJ II 2), and (2) for the coincident (i.e. non-temporal) use of the aorist see my notes on *O.* 3, 3 ὀρθώσαις and 32 σταθείς[72].

93: ἀμφίπολον. Not 'much visited' (the common translation)[73], but 'tended by cultic worship': cf. LSJ I 3, and ἀμφιπολεύω 3. Ge. thinks that Van der Valk's suggestion that the tomb acts as a servant deserves consideration "in the context of a symposium". But (1) hero worship is no symposium (see above, p. 2), and (2) the image of a tomb acting as a servant is grotesque rather than solemn.

93: πολυξενωτάτῳ. Ge. suggests that the meaning may be ambiguous, 'entertaining many guests' as well as 'visited by many

---

[70] For Ge.'s assumption of a "contrast between Tantalus' joyless existence and the honour Pelops enjoys after death" see above, p. 2.

[71] Ge. thinks that the assumption of a sympotic allusion receives further support from the fact that μείγνυμι is frequently used of mixing wine. Here the limits of philological sobriety are far overstepped.

[72] Similarly S. *Tr.* 101 κλιθείς, wrongly explained by Kamerbeek as 'for a moment leaning against'.

[73] Cf. B. K. Braswell, Glotta 58 (1980), 217.

foreigners'. He compares (of course!) the fact that Hiero's table is often surrounded by guests (17). But the idea of an altar entertaining guests is just as tasteless as that of a 'serving' tomb.

93: βωμῷ. Although the excavation of the Pelopeion has brought to light an altar, πολυξενωτάτῳ shows that the altar of Zeus is meant (Gild., Farn., *et al.*): cf. *O.* 3, 17 πανδόκῳ and my note *ad loc.*, *O.* 10, 101 βωμὸν παρ' Ὀλύμπιον.

93: κλέος. Ge. writes that "if we try to put ourselves in the position of the audience hearing the words for the first time, we would initially assume that τὸ κλέος meant 'his (that is, Pelops') fame', since Pelops is the subject of what has preceded". But if βωμῷ refers to the altar of Zeus (see preceding note), the possessive force of the article is more likely to refer to that word. In that case τᾶν Ὀλυμπιάδων is a specification of the idea of 'the area of the Olympic games' implied in the phrase 'the altar of Zeus at Olympia': cf. *O.* 10, 101 quoted above.

94: τηλόθεν. Ge. quotes Me.: "der Grieche bezeichnet Entfernungen nicht wie wir vom Standpunkt des Messenden aus, sondern von dem diesem entgegengesetzten". It should be added that this applies not only to the measuring of distances but also to the determination of directions: cf. Sol. 24 D. = 36 W., 26 ἀλκὴν πάντοθεν ποιεύμενος, Hdt. IV 101 πρὸς βορέω ἐλαύνειν, etc. For Pindar cf. M. Riemschneider-Hörner, *Die Raumanschauung bei Pindar*, Zt.f. Aesth. u. allg. Kunstwiss. 36 (1942), 96-114, espec. 97: "Wenn Pindar einen Raum bezeichnen will, so umschreitet er ihn von den Grenzen her"[74]. For 'spatial display' in Pindar cf. Race, 99-100.

94: δέδορκε. Ge. rightly observes that δέρκομαι denotes a radiant look, but his conclusion, "hence it is often used of the Sun who sees by means of his own bright rays", is not quite clear: it should be added that the sun could be imagined as having eyes or being an eye because human seeing was considered to be based on the emanation of light from the eyes, so that conversely light was associated with sight: see my note on *O.* 3, 20 ἑσπέρας ὀφθαλμός and the literature mentioned there.

Ge. notes that "the perfect tense has a present force, a common feature of verbs of sight, sound and smell": it should be added that the perfect has intensifying force: cf. K.G. I, 148-9, Schw. II, 263.

94-5: ἐν δρόμοις Πέλοπος. Cf. *N.* 10, 48 πὰρ Διὸς δρόμῳ. For the amplifying force of the plural see my note on *O.* 3, 6 στέφανοι. The phrase has been added (1) in order to identify the area of the Olympic games with the race-course where Pelops had competed with Oenomaus, and

---

[74] It might be observed that τηλόθεν may be equivalent to τηλόθι (cf. *N.* 2, 12, Hom. Ψ 359), but a locative sense does not suit the present context.

(2) because Hiero's victory has been gained in a horse-race[75]. Accordingly, ἐν is slightly ambiguous: it first means 'situated in', but then 'gained in': Fenn. compares *O.* 8, 56-7 Νεμέᾳ ... χάριν. Ge. rightly remarks that there is no justification for treating ἐν as causal (Jur.): Jur. compares *I.* 1, 57 ἐν γναμπτοῖς δρόμοις, but there ἐν means 'with regard to' (Privitera compares *O.* 13, 51). Ge. suggests that "Pindar is being deliberately ambiguous" so that Πέλοπος may be connected both with κλέος and δρόμοις. He compares *O.* 3, 23, but there Κρονίου belongs to βάσσαις only (see my note *ad loc.*), and *O.* 10, 28-30, but Vilj. rightly argues that ὑπέρβιον goes with Αὐγέαν alone.

95: ποδῶν. Including those of horses: cf. *O.* 3, 3-4.

95: ἐρίζεται. Not a middle (Sitzler): see Ge.

96: θρασύπονοι. For boldness as a prerequisite for victory see above, on 81 κίνδυνος.

97-8. Ge. writes that "a comparison is suggested between Hieron and Pelops, since λοιπὸν ἀμφὶ βίοτον ... ἔχει, with its rare use of temporal ἀμφί, makes us think of τύμβον ἀμφίπολον ἔχων (93)". But (1) temporal ἀμφί is not rare (see above, on 50 ἀμφί), and (2) ἀμφι- in ἀμφίπολον is not temporal. Ge. continues: "It is also probable that εὐδίαν is intended to remind us of the sympotic εὐφροσύνα which is denied to Tantalus (58), granted to Pelops (90-2) [but see above, p. 2], and ascribed to Hieron (see note on παίζομεν, 16)". He argues that "correct sympotic behaviour demands the presence of 'calm, peace, quiet' ", but εὐδία does not refer to behaviour: Ge. himself admits that it denotes "the feeling of security" as contrasted with "the πόνος necessary for athletic success". For the *topos* of lasting fame as λάθα πόνων cf. Hubbard, 76-7 n. 14[76].

99: γε. Fenn. explains γε as having culminating force, but in that case we should expect a stronger term than εὐδία.

99: δέ. Ge. correctly explains the gnome as "a cautionary reminder that although he has a 'honied calm for the rest of his life', it is not an all-embracing or absolute εὐδία, but one limited to victory in the games", but his translation of δέ as 'but' is misleading, for it has explanatory, rather than adversative, force (see above, on 30 δέ): it introduces the motivation of the restriction ἀέθλων γ' ἕνεκεν, and suggests that a victory in itself is a supreme but temporary good. This interpretation disposes

---

[75] This does not imply, however, that "Hierons Ruhm ist Abglanz jenes ersten Glanzes, denn Pelops war der erste, dessen Mannheit in Olympia sichtbar wurde" (Bernard, 33; similarly Köhnken, 200): see above p. 4 and n. 11.

[76] W. J. Slater, in D. E. Gerber (ed.), *Greek Poetry and Philosophy: Studies in Honour of L. Woodbury* (Chico 1984), 251 n. 64, maintains that the idea of peace and rest after toil "is in the archaic Greek mind always associated with song and festivity", but festivity lasting λοιπὸν ἀμφὶ βίοτον is physically impossible.

of the objection raised by Burz., that a distributive meaning of αἰεί (see next note) conflicts with the sense of 97-8.

99: αἰεί. Not 'ever renewed day by day' (Fenn.; similarly Jur., Sitzler, Burz.), but to be taken in a distributive sense (Ge.) equivalent to German *jeweils*. See further my note on Hes. *Th.* 34, Mnem. IV 25 (1972), 240 and n. 5[77].

100: ὕπατον. Ge. writes that "Greek literature constantly dwells on the fragility of human happiness", but it should be added that Pindar has a particularly keen sense of the vicissitudinous nature of human life: see my notes on *O.* 7, 11 ἄλλοτε δ' ἄλλον and 95 ἄλλοτ' ἀλλοῖαι, and *O.* 12, 12a πεδάμειψαν. To the literature mentioned there may be added O. Schroeder, Hermes 53 (1918), 324 ff., W. C. Greene, *Moira* (Cambridge Mass. 1944), 74-5, Strohm, 59 ff.

100: ἔρχεται. Ge. compares *P.* 3, 105-6, *N.* 1, 32-3, *N.* 7, 30-1, but there the meaning is 'go', here 'come', 'fall to': cf. *O.* 3, 39 ἐλθεῖν and my note *ad loc.*

100: δέ. Ge. argues that this sentence is "part of a priamel. Having spoken of an ἐσλόν which is 'highest for all mortals', that is, the general truth with which a priamel often begins, Pindar now implies that the ἐσλόν which is his highest obligation is praise of the victor". This is a serious misunderstanding: (1) A priamel often begins with a general truth, but this serves as a parallel for another general truth, not as a rule of which the next sentence forms a special application. (2) The meaning of ἐσλόν is 'profit' (LSJ II 3), and Pindar cannot imply that the victory ode is his own profit. Ge. adds that "even when the priamel structure is not present, contrast alone frequently provides a sufficient transition to praise of the victor". But in the present case the transition has a consecutive rather than an adversative character: a victory in the games does not guarantee permanent happiness <because its fame is quickly forgotten> (cf. e.g. fr. 121, 4 θνάσκει δὲ σιγαθὲν καλὸν ἔργον), 'and therefore' the poet has to preserve it in a song of praise (cf. e.g. *O.* 11, 3-5). For consecutive δέ cf. Denn., 170, and see my note on *O.* 7, 31.

101: ἱππίῳ νόμῳ. 'A strain in honour of a victory in a horse-race' (Farn.). Köhnken (204), followed by Ge., goes too far in arguing that 'horse' is "the theme" and "central topics" of the ode: see above, pp. 2-3. Ge. himself admits that "a Castor-song [*P.* 2, 69, *I.* 1, 16] is simply a song in honour of a victor in a chariot-race".

102: Αἰοληΐδι μολπᾷ. Ge. thinks that the metre is meant, but the

[77] Ge. refers to W. Marg, *Der Charakter in der Sprache der frühgriechischen Dichtung* (Würzburg 1938), 51-4, but there the distributive and the durative αἰεί are not clearly distinguished.

parallel *P.* 2, 69 τὸ Καστόρειον δ' ἐν Αἰολίδεσσι χορδαῖς shows that the phrase refers to the musical mode. Fenn. wrongly thinks that the phrase stands in apposition to νόμῳ: the dative has modal force: cf. K.G. I, 435, Schw. II, 162, Bruhn, § 48.

103: χρή. Ge.'s explanation is obscure and misleading: "The achievement of success in the games imposes the severest demands upon the contestant and Pindar feels a corresponding demand to celebrate that success and to ensure its remembrance". The fact that the conception of the victory ode as a debt to the victor is a *topos* in Pindar (see my note on *O.* 3, 7 χρέος) shows that he wants to say something more than that the song had been ordered: although he was paid for it, he likes to represent it as a friendly office: cf. e.g. *O.* 10, 12, *P.* 1, 60, *N.* 7, 62-3, and above, on 16 φίλαν. Accordingly, it is misleading to say that "the whole χρέος-motif ... surely has its basis in this contractual relationship between subject and object" (Hubbard, 161): Pindar did not draw a sharp distinction between business and friendship.

103: ξένον. Ge. observes that this "repeats the earlier praise of Hieron's hospitality (14-17)", but it should be added that the word also qualifies χρή as a friendly office (see preceding note). I do not believe that ξένον "continues the analogy between Hieron and Pelops whose altar is host to many visitors (93)": see above, note *ad loc.*

104-5: μή ... κυριώτερον. For the litotes in vaunts cf. Race, 112-3.

104: καλῶν τε ἴδριν. I do not believe that this refers to knowledge of "all that is noble, honourable, beautiful, refined" (Ge.)[78], for ἴδρις usually means 'expert', 'experienced', so that the phrase probably alludes to Hiero's artistic connoisseurship: cf. *O.* 11, 18 μητ' ἀπείρατον καλῶν, and see further above, on 15 μουσικᾶς. Pindar suggests that Hiero is one of the συνετοί able to value his poetry at its true worth (cf. *O.* 2, 85).

104: † ἅμα. Ge. concludes that ὧδε (Von der Mühll) and ἄμμι (Mommsen) are the best emendations. But (1) ὧδε is palaeographically unattractive, and (2) there does not seem to be a parallel for an ἀπὸ κοινοῦ construction of the comparative: Ge. refers to the use of single οὔτε, but that is different[79]. Ge. rightly observes that Young's μᾶλλον is metrically impossible. One might consider ὁμῶς: the two words can easily be confused in minuscule script. For the responsion of choriambus and trochee cf. *P.* 4, 118 and 184, etc.: see my note on *O.* 3, 35 βαθυζώνου. For the asymmetry of 'equally ... and more ...' cf. my notes on *O.* 3, 18 στέφανόν τε and *O.* 7, 81 εὐτυχέων.

---

78 Similarly Fränkel, 541 n. 11, Burz. Sitzler's 'kampfeskundig' is certainly wrong.

79 Such cases as Hdt. IX 26, 7 δίκαιον ἡμέας ἔχειν τὸ ἕτερον κέρας ἤπερ 'Αθηναίους are also different: cf. K.G. II, 303.

104: δύναμιν. It appears from κυριώτερον that δύναμιν does not refer to Hiero's ability of putting his knowledge into practice (Ge., who compares Pl. *Meno* 77 b 3 χαίρειν τε καλοῖσι καὶ δύνασθαι), but to political and military power: cf. 12, *O.* 11, 18-9, *P.* 1, 47-50, *P.* 2, 58, 63-5, *P.* 5, 13, etc.

105: νῦν. Ge. uncritically adopts Bundy's suggestion (I, 5 n. 18) that this marks the general statement (97-100) as a foil for the praise of the victor: the parallels adduced by Ge., and especially his reference to Fraenkel's note on A. *Ag.* 532, show that the phrase is an expression of reserve.

105: κλυταῖσι. Ge. writes: "the epithet may have been especially chosen to remind us of the κλέος in vv 23 and 93", but this is too vague: the word means 'glorious', 'splendid' (cf. Hom. ι 308 κλυτὰ μῆλα), but has the causative overtone of 'glorifying': see above, on 8 πολύφατος. Similarly *O.* 14, 21 κλυτὰν ... ἀγγελίαν, *I.* 2, 2 κλυτᾷ φόρμιγγι, *P.* 3, 114 κλειναῖς ἀοιδαῖς, *I.* 2, 19 κλειναῖς ... χαρίτεσσιν, *O.* 2, 90 εὐκλέας ὀϊστούς, *O.* 10, 85 παρ' εὐκλέϊ Δίρκᾳ, *N.* 6, 29 οὖρον ἐπέων εὐκλέα. See further my notes on *O.* 7, 11 ζωθάλμιος ('causing life to bloom'), *O.* 10, 4 ὀρθᾷ χερί ('rectifying')[80].

105: δαιδαλωσέμεν. 'Adorn', 'embellish', hence 'glorify': cf. *O.* 5, 21 δαιδάλλειν, *N.* 11, 18 δαιδαλθέντα. The word has the overtone of 'skilfully' (Fränkel, 572): see above, 29 δεδαιδαλμένοι and note *ad loc.*

Ge. refers to Bundy I, 21, who states that futures in encomiastic contexts are "often fulfilled by the mere pronunciation of the word", but this is not a clear explanation: see above, on 36 φθέγξομαι. Ge. further thinks that there is a contrast between the present passage and 29, but that line does not refer to praise.

105: ὕμνων. Similarly *I.* 2, 45 ὕμνους, where Thu. compares *O.* 2, 1, *O.* 6, 27, *N.* 7, 81, *I.* 3-4, 61. He wrongly concludes that the ode is regarded "als ein buntes Gewebe einzelner 'laudes' ": for the amplifying force of the plural see my note on *O.* 3, 6 στέφανοι.

105: πτυχαῖς. Ge. defends Boeckh's interpretation 'artificiosi flexus numerorum harmoniae, saltationis' (cf. schol.) by comparing fr. 107 ab, 3 καμπύλον μέλος, but πτύξ and πτυχή are never used in the sense of poetical or musical 'turn'. The image more probably refers to a garment: cf. *I.* 1, 32 περιστέλλων ἀοιδάν. In that case the folds indicate the fact that a solemn or festive garment is meant: cf. Hom. *H. Dem.* 176, S. fr. 494,

---

[80] For the causative use of adjectives in Aeschylus cf. J. A. Schuursma, *De poetica vocabulorum abusione apud Aeschylum* (Amsterdam 1932), 52-3, to whose list may be added *Pers.* 220 πρευμενῶς ('propitiating'), 609 πρευμενεῖς χοας (cf. LSJ πρᾶος II). Some examples from Sophocles and Euripides are *Aj.* 206 θολερῷ ('confusing'), *Ba.* 423 ἄλυπον ('appeasing').

E. *Suppl.* 979. Ge objects that "περιστέλλω is much more suggestive of clothing than δαιδαλόω", but it should be added that ὑφαίνω is used with regard to poetry at *N.* 4, 44, *I.* 9, 8, fr. 179, Bacch. 5, 9 and 19, 8. Bacchylides suggests an 'etymological' connection between ὕμνος and ὑφαίνω, and the same allusion may be present in the phrase ὕμνων πτυχαῖς.

106: θεός. Ge. rightly translates 'For a god ...': see above, on 64 θεόν. He thinks that "Hieron may have considered Zeus Αἰτναῖος as his patron deity", but *P.* 2, 12 ὀρσοτρίαιναν εὐρυβίαν καλέων θεόν, quoted by Jur. (who rightly adds: "An eine weitere Parallele zwischen Hieron und Pelops ist jedoch nicht zu denken"), seems to me to carry more weight.

106: ἐπίτροπος ἐών. Taken by Ge. to go with μερίμναισιν, but more probably used absolutely: 'acting as a guardian'.

106: μήδεται. Ge. translates 'gives (you) counsel', understanding τοι from τεαῖσι, but I cannot find parallels for μήδομαί τινι 'give counsel to'. Ge. rightly remarks that "the sense conveyed by μήδεται is surely the same as that conveyed by μῆδος in *P.* 10.10-11 ... ὁ μέν που τεοῖς τε μήδεσι τοῦτ' ἔπραξεν", but μῆδος there means 'deliberation', 'plan' rather than 'counsel' (Ge.), and the phrase τεοῖς μήδεσι is virtually equivalent to 'through you': cf. Hom. Κ 497 διὰ μῆτιν 'Αθήνης 'on the initiative of Athena', and see above, on 31 ἐμήσατο. Similarly, in the present passage μήδεται may be translated by 'he operates'. For μερίμναισι as a dative of interest after μήδεται (called "more difficult" by Ge.) cf. Hom. ε 188-9 ἅσσ' ἂν ἐμοί περ / αὐτῇ μηδοίμην.

107: ἔχων τοῦτο κᾶδος. Ge. rightly argues that "having been told that a god acts as a guardian of, is entrusted with, Hieron's endeavours, we expect a reference to the concern such a deity shows in the exercise of his guardianship". He compares *N.* 10, 54 μάλα μὲν ἀνδρῶν δικαίων περικαδόμενοι, but his interpretation of τοῦτο as the equivalent of τούτων μεριμνῶν (or as equivalent to τοιοῦτον: 'a concern typical of a god who is ἐπίτροπος') is unconvincing[81]. It is much more natural to take τοῦτο to mean τὸ ἐπίτροπος εἶναι and κᾶδος to be predicate: 'having this as his concern', i.e., performing his guardianship not as a more or less official task, but with personal interest[82].

108: μερίμναισιν. Ge. observes the separation of the noun from τεαῖσι, but does not explain it: see my note on *O.* 12, 6a ἐλπίδες.

108: μὴ ... λίποι. For the negative expression cf. Race, 111.

109: γλυκυτέραν. Ge. suggests that μέριμναν should be understood, which is unlikely, for the subject of the next victory ode will not be Hiero's ambition, but its realization. It is true that a number of Greek

---

[81] Le.' translation 'il dio che t'è prossimo' is obviously impossible.

[82] Fenn.'s translation 'resourceful' is not correct.

substantives which originally denote subjective states or activities are also used to refer to their objects or results (e.g. ἐπιθυμία 'object of desire' LSJ II), but I do not know a clear example of such a use of μέριμνα. Ge. adds "that Greek is very fond of using the feminine accusative of an adjective 'für unbestimmte Abstracta' (Wilamowitz on Eur. *HF* 681; cf. Fraenkel on Aesch. *Agam.* 916), so that ἔτι γλυκυτέραν may be simply 'still greater sweetness' ". He rightly compares *O.* 7, 82 ἄλλαν, but there the preceding εὐτυχέων shows that εὐτυχίαν is to be understood. Similarly, in the present passage we have to supply a cognate accusative *κλέϊξιν (Schr.). See further my note on *O.* 7, 82 ἄλλαν, and cf. also *N.* 6, 20 τρεῖς (scil. στεφανώσεις) στεφανωσάμενος. Wilamowitz rightly argues that in such cases as Pl. *Euthyd.* 273 b 4 ἄλλην καὶ ἄλλην ἀποβλέποντε we should not supply ὁδόν, but his term 'unbestimmt' is misleading, and Fraenkel's conclusion, "there is no noun to be supplied", is still more misleading: even when there does not exist a noun corresponding with the verb, we should supply the corresponding notion as an internal accusative.

For γλυκύς as a stereotyped quality of the victory ode see above, on 19 γλυκυτάταις.

109: ἔλπομαι. 'I expect' rather than 'I hope' (the common translation): see my note on *O.* 12, 6a ἐλπίδες. Similarly *P.* 10, 55-8 ἔλπομαι ... τὸν Ἱπποκλέαν ... θαητὸν ... θησέμεν. For Pindar's habit of hinting around for new commissions cf. S. Gzella, Eos 58 (1969-70), 174-5.

110: σὺν ἅρματι. Ge. writes "Syntactically there is no objection to taking the phrase with γλυκυτέραν, since the sweetness is the sweetness of victory". But we have seen above that γλυκυτέραν refers to the victory ode, not to the victory. Consequently, ἅρματι does not refer to Hiero's chariot, but to that of the poet and the Muses: for that image cf. *O.* 6, 21-4, *O.* 9, 81, *P.* 10, 65, *N.* 1, 7, *I.* 2, 2, *I.* 8, 61, etc. This image seems to have been created by Pindar by combining two ideas, viz. the epic tradition of the gods driving chariots and the metaphor of the victory ode as a chariot (*O.* 6, 21-4, *N.* 1, 7)[83].

The instrumental force of σύν (cf. Fenn. 'by the aid of', and K.G. I, 467, LSJ A 2 and 4) primarily refers to κλεΐξειν because 'chariot' is a metaphor for victory ode: cf. *O.* 6, 21-4, *N.* 1, 7.

110: θοῷ. Not only a traditional epithet of ἅρμα (cf. Ge.) but probably alluding to the 'swiftness' of Pindar's style: cf. *P.* 10, 54 θύνει, *P.* 1, 82 ἐν βραχεῖ, fr. 107 ab, 1-3 ἵππον ἢ κύνα ... μιμέο. For the difference between θοός and ὠκύς see my note on *O.* 12, 3 θοαί.

---

[83] See further Dorns., *P.S.*, 58, Becker, 71, Schwenn, 17-8, Simpson, 438 ff., Gianotti, 66 and n. 97, Wilamowitz on E. *H.F.* 779, Maehler, 92 n. 1, M. Durante, in R. Schmitt, *Indogermanische Dichtersprache* (Darmstadt 1968), 253 ff.

110: κλεΐξειν. Ge. writes: "I have retained κλεΐζειν on the admittedly weak grounds that the present infinitive follows ἔλπομαι in v 64": a weak argument indeed. The use of ἄν or κεν with the future in Attic has been well defended by A. C. Moorhouse, CQ 40 (1946), 1-10, who points out that the meaning is 'I think I shall', 'I certainly shall', which perfectly suits the present context[84].

111: ἐπίκουρον. Ge. does not make a clear choice between three possibilities: (1) scil. σοι, (2) scil. μοι, (3) governing λόγων. (3) is certainly wrong: Hiero's future victory cannot be called 'a road which will help me to compose a poem'[85]. (2) (e.g. Jur., Burz.) is extremely unlikely, for if μοι is equivalent to 'my chariot of song' (Ge.), the result is that 'my way of words', i.e. my song, helps my song[86]. (1) is supported by *O.* 13, 97 'Ολιγαιθίδαισίν τ' ἔβαν ἐπίκουρος and *O.* 9, 83-4 ἦλθον/τιμάορος 'Ισθμίαισι Λαμπρομάχου μίτραις (cf. also Becker, 79): these parallels show that "the help consists in the celebration of the victory" (Ge.).

111: εὑρών. Stresses the poet's claim of originality: see my note on *O.* 3, 4 νεοσίγαλον εὑρόντι.

111: εὐδείελον. 'Sunny' rather than 'far-seen' (e.g. LSJ): see note on *O.* 10, 50 νιφάδι.

111: ἐλθών. Does not imply that "Pindar will come to Olympia with his chorus" (Ge., who at the beginning of this paragraph more correctly writes that "Pindar's coming to Olympia need not be treated any more literally than many of the passages in which the poet is said to come to the victor's home"): cf. Becker, 81-2, Bowra, 360-1, and see above, on 10 ἱκομένους. Ge. further argues that "coming from Olympia [7-8] and coming to Olympia balance each other and appear at virtually equal distance from the beginning and end of the ode", but I cannot believe that such a 'balance' was intentional.

111: ἐμοί. Ge. thinks that "the emphatic position of the pronoun suggests a contrast ... between what god can do for Hieron and what Pindar can do". But the main contrast is between Pindar's intention (κλεΐξειν) and his capability, a contrast emphasized by μὲν ὤν ('at any rate'). It should be borne in mind that the personal pronoun is often used in Greek when no contrast with other persons is involved: cf. my note on Hes. *Op.* 33 ἐφέλλοις, where I have quoted Abicht's explanation (on Hdt. VII 6,

---

[84] See further my note on Thuc. II 80, 1, Mnem. IV 18 (1965), 303-4, and the literature mentioned there. Cf. also De Vries on Pl. *Phdr.* 227 b 9-10, K. A. Worp, Mnem. IV 28 (1975), 120-1, G. J. de Vries on Pl. *Symp.* 220 a 1-3, Mnem. IV 33 (1980), 351, C. J. Ruijgh, Mnem. IV 38 (1985), 178.

[85] S. Fogelmark, AC 45 (1976), 127, argues that the hoped-for victory "will open the road of words", but one road can hardly be said to 'open' another road.

[86] Jur. argues that ὁδόν means 'Stoff': he compares *N.* 7, 51 and *N.* 6, 54, but there the word refers to a song rather than to its subject.

4): "Treten zwei Handlungen desselben Subjekts in Gegensatz, so denkt sich der Grieche, dass auch das handelnde Subjekt mit sich in Gegensatz trete".

112: Μοῖσα. For Pindar's belief in the assistance of the Muse(s) see my note on *O*. 3, 4 Μοῖσα.

112: καρτερώτατον. Probably a resultative predicate (Sitzler): see above, on 68 μέλαν, and cf. Pl. *Rep*. 565 c 10 τοῦτον τρέφειν τε καὶ αὔξειν μέγαν, K.G. I, 319.

112: βέλος. For the image of the poet as an archer cf. Dorns., *P.S.*, 58. Such parallels as *O*. 2, 89 ἔπεχε νῦν σκοπῷ τόξον, *O*. 9, 12 οὔτοι χαμαιπετέων λόγων ἐφάψεαι, *P*. 6, 37 χαμαιπετὲς δ' ἄρ' ἔπος οὐκ ἀπέριψεν, A. *Suppl*. 446 γλῶσσα τοξεύσασα μὴ τὰ καίρια show that the point of the comparison is that both try to hit the mark[87]. I do not believe that "such imagery is derived from the similarity between the shape of the bow and the lyre and from the dual role of Apollo, patron deity of poets, as archer and lyre-player" (Ge.).

112: ἀλκᾷ. Ge. concludes that "there is a strong possibility that here, as so often in Pindar, ambiguity is intended, ἀλκᾷ meaning both 'in valour' [a dative of limitation with καρτερώτατον] and 'for my assistance' [i.e. the assistance lent by me to the victor]". Apart from the doubtful character of such an ambiguity, I agree with Gild. that "it is more vigorous" to take the dative with τρέφει: the Muse nurses the poet's missile with valour, just as at *N*. 10, 13 Zeus θρέψε δ' αἰχμὰν 'Αμφιτρύωνος. This is not a mere metaphor for "Amphitryon as a warrior" (Ge.), for Pindar probably has in mind the epic conception of weapons as living beings: cf. Γ 338 etc., where a spear is called ἄλκιμος, and see further my remarks in Lampas 2 (1969), 97. Similarly Sophocles (*Ph*. 1151) speaks of τὰν πρόσθεν βελέων ἀλκάν[88].

Ge. argues that the conception of poetry as having 'valour' "can be easily defended": "arrows have ἀλκή ... so that there is no objection to metaphorical arrows also having ἀλκή". But why does Pindar choose an image with a martial connotation? "Wuchtige Eindrucksfähigkeit" (Schwenn, 243) is too vague. The song of praise really has a defensive

---

[87] See further Durante (above, n. 83), 247-50. Simpson (471) rightly connects the metaphor of archery with the ideal of speaking κατὰ καιρόν, but he adds a number of irrelevant associations: "a permanent and telling effect" ..."The poet's *persona* ... assumes the identity of Apollo ... god of death and healing ... shooting ... arrows which transform". "The power and mobility of a divinely inspired imagination which can range far" may be a secondary implication: cf. Becker, 83, who compares *N*. 6, 48-9. For athletic metaphors for poetry see further Hubbard, 152-3.

[88] Consequently, the phrase does not involve a mixing of metaphors, as is assumed by W. J. Slater, CJ 72 (1977), 202.

purpose, protecting the victor from oblivion, derogation, and backbiting inspired by the envy of his surroundings: cf. e.g. *O.* 2, 97-8, *O.* 8, 55, *P.* 1, 84, *P.* 2, 76, *P.* 11, 28-9, *N.* 7, 61, *N.* 8, 20-2, *I.* 2, 43-4, and see Gund., 53. Similarly, 110 ἐπίκουρον probably has the overtone of 'military ally'. Cf. also notes on *O.* 10, 88 ποιμένα, *O.* 11, 9 ποιμαίνειν.

Ge. further suggests that "the *alka* of Pindar's song is equated with the *alka* of Pelops as displayed by his willingness to contend against Oenomaus and by implication with the *alka* of Hieron as displayed by his intention to compete in the chariot-race at Olympia". This is another arbitrary construction based on the assumption of hidden associations.

113: ἐπ' ἄλλοισι. Ge. seems to me right in preferring this reading, but the meaning is 'on account of' rather than 'with regard to' (Ge.): see my note on *O.* 14, 15.

For the idea that different men excel in different areas Ge. refers to Bundy I, 7, but there the *topos* of the diversity of human life is not clearly distinguished from the *topos* of the vicissitude of human life. See further note on *O.* 11, 20 διαλλάξαιντο.

Hubbard (144) rightly observes that gnomes "often serve to effect a transition between subjective and objective concerns". It should be added that the present gnome serves to turn our (and Hiero's) attention from speculations about future excellence to actual excellence, his rulership.

113: ἔσχατον. Hubbard's interpretation (15) of the ἔσχατον as an ambivalent notion, combining the far (as the ultimate end) and the near (as a limit), is an artificial construction.

113: κορυφοῦται. Ge. rightly observes that "Pindar does not mean that kings are superior to poets, only that in one area of endeavour kingship is the ultimate goal that can be reached", but his translation 'is reserved for' is too vague: at Hom. Δ 426 κορυφοῦται is said of a wave, and a wave which crests itself cannot become higher; similarly, kingship is the culminating point in the field of rulership.

114: μηκέτι. The asyndeton has consecutive force and marks the conclusion to be drawn: see my note on *O.* 3, 45 οὐ. Similarly *I.* 2, 30 and 43.

Ge. argues that the purpose of the warning (for which see also my note on *O.* 3, 44 Ἡρακλέος) "is encomiastic rather than admonitory". He compares *O.* 5, 24 and *I.* 7, 43-4, which he takes to imply that the victor's achievement could be surpassed only by that of a god, and "that is high praise indeed". This is correct, but it is only part of the truth: Ge. neglects the imperatives used at *O.* 1, 114, *O.* 5, 24, *I.* 5, 14, and the warning tone of e.g. *O.* 3, 45 and *I.* 3-4, 31. Pindar is both a *laudator* and a preacher, and it is impossible (and unnecessary) to dissolve the latter into the former.

114: πάπταινε. Ge. writes: "Snell 3 rightly points out that in Homer παπταίνειν 'denotes a visual attitude, and does not hinge upon the function of sight as such' ", but it is essential to add Snell's preceding sentence (14), "παπταίνειν ist auch ein 'Blicken', ein 'Umsichblicken', ein suchendes, irrsichtiges oder ängstliches".

115: εἴη. The asyndeton marks the final conclusion: see above, on 114 μηκέτι.

115: τοῦτον. Ge. explains, 'throughout your life', referring to LSJ C I 5 "for οὗτος used of the second person", but the examples given there are completely different. K.G. (I, 645) rightly adopt the ancient explanation ὃν ζῶμεν (schol.), but the examples of οὗτος used of "was der Redende vor sich sieht, mit seinen Sinnen wahrnimmt" are no parallels, for Pindar's text does not suggest that Hiero is seeing or has to see his life before his eyes. Fränkel's translation (*W.u.F.*, 20) '(von jetzt an) weiterhin' (similarly Le.) is equally unparalleled. I agree with Fenn. and Farn. that πόρσιον probably alludes to the world after death (similarly Schwenn, 243-4), so that τοῦτον refers to the idea of earthly life implied in μηκέτι .. πόρσιον.

115: ὑψοῦ ... πατεῖν. Ge. rightly observes that this means "simply to enjoy great success", but his reference to 100 ὕπατον and *O.* 2, 22 ὑφηλόν is insufficient: cf. Hom. N 371 ὕψι βιβάντα.

Ge. further suggests that "it is the contrast between Tantalus and Hieron that Pindar is especially emphasizing", but although there exists a contrast between their lives, it is not emphasized or even alluded to.

116: ὁμιλεῖν. Ge. compares *P.* 2, 96 ἁδόντα δ' εἴη με τοῖς ἀγαθοῖς ὁμιλεῖν. It should be added that the term ὁμιλεῖν belongs to the *topos* of φιλία illustrated above, on 16 φίλαν.

Ge. (p. 169) thinks that "the association of poet and king seems to be a reminiscence of Hes. *Theog.* 94-6", but (1) Hesiod's king, too, excels in eloquence, and (2) it is misleading to say that *Th.* 98-104 refer to "the benefits which a poet ... can bestow upon kings": these benefits are not restricted to a special audience.

116: πρόφαντον σοφίᾳ. Rightly taken by Ge. as "a statement of fact, not part of the prayer": for Pindar's self-confidence see my notes on *O.* 7, 8 καρπὸν φρενός and 11 Χάρις. It is misleading to say that "the purpose of the statement, however, is not so much to sing his own praises as ... to assure Hieron that his poetic skill is equal to the task of praising those who have been victorious in the games": Pindar emphasizes his poetic skill to such a degree that it equals self-praise, and the latter has a purpose of its own, viz. to maintain his own position as a poet.

For σοφίᾳ as a dative of limitation see above, on 87 πτεροῖσιν.

OLYMPIAN 10

Date

Not a very long time after the victory (476), for the victor is still a παῖς ἐρατός (99). It is true that Pindar speaks of a long delay in the delivery of the poem (7), but this seems to be an exaggeration intended to enhance the importance of the victory and of the ode: cf. 85 ff., *N.* 3, 80, Thummer, 87, Nassen, 224; see also below, on 9 τόκος. On the other hand, I do not believe that "*O.* 10 was actually not much later than any ode would be 'late' in comparison with an ode performed at the scene of victory" (Hubbard, 61): 3 ἐπιλέλαθα, although it need not be taken completely serious (see note *ad loc.*), is more than "a playful excuse" (Hubbard, 62)[1]: at any rate, it is an excuse, and as such points to an actual delay. For the question of date see further Vilj., 11-4, Wüst, 258-9, Erbse, 92 ff.[2].

Metre

I propose the following analysis:

2 *an* 2 *cr*
ia do
2 *ia reiz ba gl*
ba 2 *cr*
ia cr
gl

chodim do
gl
2 *ia chodim*
reiz 2 *ia*[3] *sp*
tel
sp ia
2 *an*
3 *an ia*
reiz 2 *cr cho*

[1] E. Kurz, in *Musa iocosa: Festschrift A. Thierfelder* (Hildesheim 1974), 9-10, rightly argues that there must have been some delay, but I doubt whether its description is humorous: in Pindar's eyes the debt of an ode is a debt of friendship (see below, on 6 ἀλιτόξενον), and that is a serious matter. Cf. also H. Schmitz, *Hypsos und Bios* (Bern 1970), 47. See further below, on 3 ἐπιλέλαθα.

[2] In his conclusion (103) he suggests that the poet mentions his debt in order to express his sympathy for the victor and his love of truth. This may be accepted, but Erbse goes too far in adding that these two sentiments "das ganze Gedicht durchdringen".

[3] Tur.'s *an hem* seems to me less probable in the rhythmical context.

For some anomalies see notes on 9 θνατῶν, 25 βωμῷ, 46 πέδον, 71 ἄκοντι, 105 ἄλαλκε.

Composition

The structure of the poem is so simple that it hardly needs to be analysed in detail. The only point where we have to look for a link in the argument is 24, where the tale of the establishment of the Olympic games starts rather abruptly. But it may be argued that just as 17-23 elaborate the important role of the trainer, 24 ff. refer back to 16 'Ολυμπιάδι and elaborate the importance of the Olympic games. In fact, the function of the myth seems to be similar to that of the myth in *O.* 3, viz. to enhance the glory of the games, and indirectly that of the victor, by tracing back their origin to Heracles, the son of Zeus.

Attempts to discover special analogies between the myth and the victor prove to be futile on closer examination. For instance, it has been suggested[4] that "la storia dell' origine dei giochi olimpici stabilisce una chiara linea di continuità tra passato e presente; tra la prima edizione degli agoni e quella in cui il giovanissimo figlio di Archestrato ha riportato la vittoria nel pugilato". But Pindar does not draw a parallel between the first victors and the present victor, and he does not even call the latter their epigone ("un epigono dei grandi atleti del passato"). It is significant that his only suggestion of continuity refers to the celebration of Zeus (78-83), not to that of the victor.

Nassen (220) claims that the poem has "an intricately interwoven, artistically contrived internal structure" and that "this structure is achieved primarily by a recurrence of imagery, thought and vocabulary and by a progression and expansion of themes throughout the ode which result in Pindar's creation of a unified whole", but the arguments adduced in support of this view are meagre and inconclusive: see my notes on 17 φερέτω χάριν, 34 ξεναπάτας, 43-5, 54 ἀλάθειαν, 64 ff., 74 εὐώπιδος, 85 χρόνῳ, 97 σπουδᾷ, 105 θάνατον.

Kromer (421-2) thinks that the structure of the poem is determined by the contrast between ἀτρέκεια and ἀλάθεια in relation to the concept of time. This view is based on a number of gratuitous assumptions which will be discussed in the commentary: see notes on 1 ἀνάγνωτε, 3 γέγραπται, 4 'Αλάθεια, 9 τόκος, 10 κατακλύσσει, 13 'Ατρέκεια, 15 Ἄρης, 15 τράπε, 24 θέμιτες, 24 σάματι.

---

[4] By P. Angeli Bernardini, *Mito e attualità nelle odi di Pindaro* (Rome 1983), 81-2.

Commentary

1: τόν. 'The present': cf. e.g. *P.* 10, 57 τόν, and see further R. Ullmann, SO 1 (1922), 59 ff.

1: ἀνάγνωτε. Gild.'s comment, "a humorous search in the poet's ledger", is misleading: ἀναγιγνώσκω used in the sense of 'to read' does not have the connotation of searching[5], but the poet asks for a simple report (rightly Nis. 'read out') of the place where the victor's name is recorded: see further below, on 3 ἐπιλέλαθα[6]. The request is not addressed to the Muses or the chorus (cf. Hubbard, 67 n. 165), nor to the audience (Hubbard, 67) or "someone else" (Kromer, 423), but the imperative is used 'absolutely' and has rhetorical force: cf. Vilj., 32, who compares *P.* 6, 1, *P.* 11, 38, *I.* 3-4, 15 and 53.

3: γέγραπται. For the metaphor cf. A. *Pr.* 789, *Suppl.* 179 and Friis Johansen-Whittle *ad loc.*, Hubbard 68 n. 167. Pindar is thinking of a ledger, and especially of a register of debts (cf. Vilj., 33-4, who compares Ar. *Nub.* 18-20), but the phrase does not imply "the existence of a contract between the poet and the victor" (Kromer, 422): Pindar regarded the victor as his friend (see below, on 6 ἀλιτόξενον), and probably made a simple promise.

Hubbard (68) writes: "Writing collapses the polarity between absence and presence, past and present, early and late". This conclusion is based on a misunderstanding: Pindar does not say that "the ode is written upon his mind" (Hubbard), but that the name of Agesidamus is written upon his mind.

3: γλυκύ. Pindar often emphasizes the 'sweetness' of his poetry: see my note on *O.* 7, 8 γλυκύν. The phrase γλυκὺ μέλος may even contain a pun referring to a connection between μέλος and μέλι: see note on *N.* 11, 18 μελιζέμεν.

3: ὀφείλων. Vilj. (35, 48 and n. 68) wrongly concludes that Pindar had already received his fee: he himself points out (*ibid.* and 47 n. 60) that the conception of the ode as a debt to the victor is a *topos* in Pindar: see further my notes on *O.* 1, 103 χρή and *O.* 3, 7 χρέος.

3: ἐπιλέλαθα. For the active form cf. ὄρωρα, ὄλωλα, Schw. II, 227. For the emphatic force of ἐπι- cf. Wüst, 260.

---

[5] As is assumed by Pu.: 'ouvrez le livre ... et cherchez-y'; similarly Dorns. and We. 'lest nach', Fränkel, 491 'seht nach', Schadewaldt, 15, Vilj., 34 and n. 11, Erbse, 93.

[6] Kromer (423) maintains that "throughout the ode there is an implied contrast between reading a name and naming". She refers to the fact that "in the third triad Herakles names certain geographical locations" and that "in the fourth triad the poet 'reads' the names of the first Olympic victors". In reality there is only one example of naming (50 προσεφθέγξατο), while at 64 ff. there is not the slightest suggestion of reading. It is not true either that "reading is also related to Atrekeia": ἀτρέκεια may be related to reading, but need not.

The obvious cause of the delay was not forgetfulness, but the fact that after 476 Pindar was occupied by the composition of the more important odes *O.* 1, *O.* 2, *O.* 3 (Pu., 123, Vilj., 11 and 57 n. 101). It would have made an awkward impression on the victor and the audience if the poet had intended to suggest that the commission of Agesidamus had got lost, as is assumed by Vilj., 34. Not negligence, but mere oversight seems to Pindar the least offensive explanation: the name of the victor figures in the list, open to be read by anybody. This is a rhetorical trick rather than a humorous touch, as is assumed by Gild. *et al.* (cf. Vilj., 58-9)[7].

For the close connection between memory and the poet's activity cf. Bowra, 33-4, Gianotti, 61-2.

3: **ὦ.** Suggests an intimate relationship: see my note on *O.* 14, 13.

3: **Μοῖσα.** She is not invoked as a goddess of memory (Gild., Barkhuizen, 48, Hubbard, 68), but because Pindar fulfils his promise by means of a poem (Vilj., 37-8).

3: **ἀλλά.** See note on *O.* 1, 17.

3: **σύ.** For the use of σύ and τύ cf. Ge. on *O.* 1, 85.

4: **Ἀλάθεια.** The help of the Muse sufficiently guarantees the poet's truthfulness (cf. *O.* 6, 21), but in the present case, where the sincerity of his promise to the victor might be doubted, the assistance of Aletheia provides extra security: cf. Gund., 37-8, R. Häussler, A & A 19 (1973), 138. The word probably alludes to ἐπιλέλαθα[8], but does not refer to the poet's forgetfulness (as is assumed among others by Hubbard, 68 and n. 169, where he explains the word as "the abstract capacity which does not allow things to be unnoticed, i.e. [?] which does not allow forgetfulness"): it is used in its original sense of 'non-concealment' (cf. *O.* 2, 92 ἀλαθεῖ νόῳ, Hom. ν 254 οὐ δ' ὅ γ' ἀληθέα εἶπε, πάλιν δ' ὅ γε λάζετο μῦθον)[9] and refers to the sincerity of Pindar's promise[10].

---

[7] See also Erbse, 99-100, who rightly rejects the interpretation proposed by Wüst, 255, and Le.: "il pericolo e l'imbarazzo, l'enfasi negativa, si traducono abilmente in intensificazione del valore della lode".

[8] Gild., Norwood, 252 n. 43, Bernard, 46, Barkhuizen, 48-51, who compares S. *O.R.* 366-9.

[9] See further H. Boeder, Arch. f. Begriffsgesch. 4 (1959), 91 ff. Cf. also A. Armory, YCS 20 (1966), 24-5, and my remarks in Mnem. IV 35 (1982), 156-7.

[10] Barkhuizen (49) takes the sincerity to refer to the frankness of Pindar's confession of forgetfulness, but such an emphasis does not suit the next lines. Nassen (223) is certainly wrong in thinking that the poet will rely on Truth "for endorsement of the claims which he is about to make regarding the victor and his city": he might do so in another, but not in the present, context. Kromer (426) writes: "While Atrekeia presides over finite entities which may be measured or counted, Aletheia is consistent with vitality and continuity", but such generalizations are quite arbitrary. Hubbard (104) maintains that all of Pindar's proclamations of truth "are better taken as assertions of sincerity than of historical accuracy", but see note on *O.* 1, 28b ἀλαθῆ.

For the importance attached by Pindar to truth cf. Schmid, 585 n. 13, Gund., 47-8, 50-4, 80-1, Bowra, 31-3, 358-60, Gianotti, 62-4, and my remarks in Mnem. IV 36 (1983), 29 and the references given there in n. 73.

For the deification of abstractions in Pindar see my notes on *O.* 1, 53 ἀκέρδεια, *O.* 7, 5 χάριν, *O.* 12, 3 τίν, *N.* 11, 8 Θέμις.

4: **Διός.** The addition of θυγάτηρ Διός serves not only to emphasize her divine character (Wil., 219 n. 2, Vilj., 38, Wüst, 260), but also, and primarily, to indicate her universal power: cf. *O.* 12, 1-2 παῖ Ζηνός ... Τύχα and my note *ad loc.*[11]. Similarly fr. 205, 2 ὤνασσ' Ἀλάθεια.

4: **ὀρθᾷ.** Not 'righteous' (schol., Farn., We.)[12], but raised as a sign of protest or accompaning an oath (Bernard, 45, 80 n. 65); also, and perhaps primarily, 'rectifying' (Gild., Fenn., Vilj., 37): for Pindar's use of adjectives in a causative sense see my note on *O.* 7, 11 ζωθάλμιος.

5: **ψευδέων.** Neuter rather than masculine (Farn., Dorns., Latt.): if Pindar had not kept his word, he could be accused of false promises (cf. Vilj., 36). The genitive depends on ἐνιπάν on the analogy of αἰτία with genitive. It should be added that ψευδής in itself does not imply evil intentions: cf. Luther, 83-4.

6: **ἀλιτόξενον.** Ἀλιταίνω and cognate words often denote an offence against religious principles (cf. my note on Hes. *Op.* 241), so that it here suggests the sacrosanct character of guest-friendship, like that of a γέρας (Hom. A 133, I 375), an oath (Hom. T 265), or orphanage (Hes. *Op.* 330).

It is misleading to call the construction enallage (e.g. Gild.), for compound adjectives derived from verbs often mean 'referring to the fact that something is done': cf. E. Williger, *Sprachliche Untersuchungen zu den Komposita der griechischen Dichter des 5. Jahrhunderts* (Göttingen 1928), 26 ff. See also my notes on *O.* 3, 3 Ὀλυμπιονίκαν and *O.* 12, 13-5.

For Pindar's tendency to represent his clients as his friends cf. Gund., 33 ff., 66 ff., and see my notes on *O.* 1, 16 φίλαν and 103 χρή, *O.* 3, 45 οὔ νιν διώξω, and *O.* 7, 4 γαμβρῷ. Kromer (421) ignores this element when she maintains that in the first triad "the two men are seen as parties in a business contract"[13].

7: **ἕκαθεν.** Not 'far from the moment of the promise' (e.g. Wil., 219 n. 3, Schadewaldt, 15 n. 2), for the future (μέλλων) does not have its

---

[11] Gal. writes that "Zeus es símbolo de lo verdadero por excelencia" and refers to Hom. A 526-7, but ignores 525 μετ' ἀθανάτοισι.

[12] Nis.'s 'look to the oversight' is too vague. Latt.'s 'with steady hands' is impossible, and Le.' 'cancellando il debito' is not clear.

[13] I do not believe that ἀλιτόξενον contains an ambiguity, as is assumed by V. Bers, *Enallage and Greek Style* (Leiden 1974), 47, who suggests that -ξενον may also refer to Pindar himself.

point of departure in the past, but 'far from the present' because the fulfilment has been delayed again and again (Vilj., 40 and n. 35).

7: **γάρ.** Explains the fact that there may be reproaches (Vilj., 38).

7: **ἐπελθών.** For the idea that the future approaches us, not conversely, cf. *O.* 6, 97 χρόνος ἐφέρπων, *P.* 1, 57, *N.* 7, 67, Vilj., 39 n. 32, and my note on *O.* 7, 68 ἐξοπίσω.

7: **μέλλων.** Scil. ἔσεσθαι: see my note on *O.* 12, 9. The meaning is not 'which had to come' because the victory was officially recorded (Fenn.), but 'coming' in the literal sense of the word. Schadewaldt (15 n. 2) compares *N.* 7, 17 μέλλοντα τριταῖον ἄνεμον, but it should be added that μέλλων does not have the abstract sense of 'future', but means 'which may be expected to come': cf. C. J. Ruijgh, Lingua 65 (1985), 327 and 330[14].

7: **χρόνος.** In contradistinction to Homer, where time is a kind of void, time in Pindar is an active power, as has been pointed out by Fränkel, *W.u.F.*, 1 ff., espec. 10-2. Cf. also Becker, 183-5, S. Accame, RFIC 89 (1961), 386 ff., A. N. Komornicka, Eos 64 (1976), 5-15, R. Hosek, in E. G. Schmidt (ed.), *Aischylos und Pindar* (Berlin 1981), 45 ff., and see note on *O.* 1, 33-4.

Time brings everything to fulfilment (cf. *N.* 4, 43 τελέσει), in the present case the poet's promise. Since fulfilment constitutes true reality, time is called πάντων πατήρ (*O.* 2, 17) and even a power 'superior to all the gods' (fr. 33; cf. Strohm, 63 and n. 48).

8: **καταίσχυνε.** Vilj. (40) rightly argues that this is an imperfect rather than an aorist (Gild., Fenn.), because χρόνος denotes a duration, not a point of time (cf. Wüst, 261). The gradual increase of the delay entailed a corresponding increase of the shame[15]. The common translation 'made me ashamed of my debt' cannot be correct, for there is no parallel for such a construction. The delay 'disgraced' the debt, not because the debt in itself is disgraceful, for it is a debt of friendship (and even divinely sanctioned, as is observed by Gild., who refers to *O.* 3, 7 θεόδματον χρέος), but because the increasing delay made the debt overstep the limits of due measure (καιρός). Similarly Vilj., 41 and n. 39. Erbse (102), who compares 53-4 ἐξελέγχων ... ἀλάθειαν, writes: "wie Chronos die Wahrheit über das älteste hellenische Nationalfestspiel an den Tag brachte, so auch

---

[14] Wil. (219 n. 3) thinks that μέλλοντα has the overtone of 'dawdling' (similarly Vilj., 40 and n. 35), but he himself admits that "im Wesen der Zeit liegt das Zögern nicht".

[15] Accordingly, Gal. is wrong in calling βαθύ proleptic. Hubbard (69) writes that Time "sunders the (early) event from the present (late) awareness", but I cannot find this idea in the Greek text.

über des Dichters Schuld"[16]. But it cannot be maintained that the postponement of the composition reveals the truth of the poet's debt.

8: **βαθύ.** The poet is deeply in debt, but the debt itself can hardly be called 'deep', as the common translation runs. Gild. suggests that "the column of figures goes downward, deeper and deeper as interest is added to principal", but Fenn. rightly remarks that Pindar "has no clear image of interest before him when he speaks of βαθὺ χρέος, and it is on the accumulation of indebtedness owing to delay, not merely on the original obligation, that he proposes in v. 9 to pay interest"[17]. The obvious image for a growing debt is a heap or pile, so that βαθύ should be translated by 'high': see my notes on *O*. 7, 53 and *O*. 12, 12a.

9: **λῦσαι.** 'Undo', 'bring to naught' (LSJ II 4).

9: **ἐπιμομφάν.** For the intentional sense of ἐπι- ('directed towards', 'aiming at') see my note on *O*. 14, 15 ἐπακουοῖτε.

Pindar was very sensitive to public criticism: cf. e.g. *P*. 1, 81-2 καιρὸν εἰ φθέγξαιο ... μείων ἕπεται μῶμος ἀνθρώπων. His defensive attitude refers to the victor's achievement (see note on *O*. 1, 112 ἀλκᾷ) as well as to his own (see note on *I*. 2, 43 φθονεραί). See further Gund., 42, 67 ff., S. Gzella, Eos 58 (1969-70), 19 ff., G. M. Kirkwood, in D. E. Gerber (ed.), *Greek Poetry and Philosophy: Studies in Honour of L. Woodbury* (Chico 1984), 169 ff., espec. 177-8.

9: **τόκος.** Does not refer to *O*. 11 (schol., Pu.), for a preceding poem can hardly be called 'interest', but to the extra beautiful quality of the present poem: cf. Wil., 219, Bundy I, 1 n. 4 and 33, Thummer, 87, Vilj., 42[18].

9: **θνατῶν.** Emendations such as ὀνάτωρ (LSJ), ὁρᾶτ' ὦν (Gild., Fenn., Farn., Erbse, 95 n. 9, Le.), or ἀνάτως (H. Erbse, Hermes 88 (1960), 25-7, We.) are unsatisfactory and unnecessary: there is no difficulty in the correspondence of ⏑⏑⏑–, commonly taken as a bacchius, and ⏑––: cf. Vilj., 43-4. The genitive does not depend on λῦσαι, but on ἐπιμομφάν: cf. *P*. 1, 82 μῶμος ἀνθρώπων quoted above[19].

---

[16] Similarly Nassen, 232. Kromer, on the other hand, arbitrarily assumes (421) that "in the course of O. 10 Alatheia comes to be identified with a more subjective type of truth and is associated with the final description of the song as an act of love".

[17] Bernard (81 n. 67) adopts L. Schmidt's explanation, 'deep in my thought' (similarly Schadewaldt, 20 n. 1), but such a use is unparalleled. Fränkel (491) apparently takes βαθύ adverbially, but this is equally impossible.

[18] Kromer (428) is pressing the detail by concluding that "the quality of his song will correspond to the length of time it has been delayed" (similarly Hubbard, 62). Gianotti (22), followed by Le., wrongly thinks that τόκος refers to the eternalization of the victor's fame achieved by the victory ode.

[19] Gal. objects that "Pindaro sólo utiliza el vocablo para poner de relieve la condición de mortal", but he forgets e.g. *O*. 1, 30, *P*. 6, 16, *I*. 2, 43.

9: **νῦν.** I do not believe that this contrasts with Pindar's past negligence (Vilj., 53), for the preceding sentence already implies that the negligence has been overcome. The meaning of νῦν is not purely temporal, but rather 'in the present case' (see my note on *O.* 3, 34), and the asyndeton has consecutive force (see my note on *O.* 3, 24 τούτων), and marks the conclusion to be drawn from the preceding sentence (Pu. rightly 'donc'): see my note on *O.* 3, 45 οὐ.

9: **ψᾶφον.** Symbolizes the debt (pebbles were used for reckoning: cf. LSJ II 1, Vilj., 51 n. 84)[20] and the public criticism (pebbles were used for voting: cf. LSJ II 5)[21]. The meaning of the simile has to be deduced from the context: cf. Vilj., 56, who compares *O.* 6, 100-1, *O.* 7, 94-5, *O.* 11, 19-20, etc.

9: **ἑλισσομέναν.** Does not allude to the accumulation of censure (Gild., Fenn., Pu.), but rather emphasizes the force of the stream of water: cf. Vilj., 49 n. 76, 52[22].

10: **ὁπᾷ.** Vilj. (53-4) rightly points out that this cannot be an exclamation and that an ellipse of ἐστιν ('in some way or other') is equally impossible. He proposes (52) the translation 'nou moet jullie sien hoe' ('now look how'), but admits (53 n. 87) that this is unparalleled[23]. The best solution seems to me to assume an ellipse of 'see to it that' (Pu.) and to compare the use of ὅπως with future: cf. K.G. II, 376-7, S. Amigues, *Les subordonnées finales par ὅπως en attique classique* (Paris 1977), 64-78. Self-address is very frequent in Pindar: cf. Schmid, 576 n. 7, Ge. on *O.* 1, 18 λάμβανε.

10: **κῦμα.** For the image of the song as a stream of water Vilj. (49 n. 74) compares *N.* 7, 12, etc., and refers to Dorns., *P.S.*, 62. He also compares Hom. A 249 ῥέεν αὐδή, Hes. *Th.* 39, 84, 97[24], but there the ease and charm of speech is emphasized, whereas in Pindar the predominant aspect of the image is the fact that water is the primary source and substance of life, a power which enables the poet to make the victor

---

[20] Vilj. (52 n. 86) rightly combats Norwood's view (110-4) that 'pebble' is the central image of the poem. His suggestion (51) that the image may also contain a sly dig at the scrupulosity of the Locrians in financial matters seems to me far-fetched. See further below, on 13 Ἀτρέκεια.

[21] I do not agree with Vilj. (51 n. 84) that voting-stones would be a disturbing element in the context: a victory ode concerns the whole community (cf. 11 κοινόν), so that the debt was a subject of public disapproval: for ψῆφος 'official judgement', 'public opinion' cf. LSJ II 5 c. See also Péron, 241.

[22] Nassen (222) takes the word to refer to the fact that the pebble is "now worn smooth by time and repeated calculation", a warning example of hyper-interpretation.

[23] Me. translates 'jetzt gilt es den Fall, wie' and refers to A. *Sept.* 705 and *Suppl.* 630, but these passages are no convincing parallels: cf. Vilj., 54 n. 92.

[24] Similarly G. Wilhelmi, *Untersuchungen zum Bild vom Fliessen der Sprache in der griechischen Literatur* (Tübingen 1967), 43, Nassen, 222 n. 7.

immortal by perpetuating his fame: see my notes on *O.* 3, 42 ὕδωρ and *O.* 7, 2 ἀμπέλου[25].

10: κατακλύσσει. Vilj. (49-50 and n. 76) rightly argues that the meaning is not 'wash away' (Gild.; similarly Fenn., LSJ II 1, Dorns., We.), but 'overflow' (cf. *O.* 9, 54, LSJ I 1), so that the pebble becomes invisible and in a sense disappears. He is equally right in pointing out (50-1) that κῦμα does not refer to the sea or to a river, but rather to a channel used for irrigation: cf. Hom. Φ 257-63, espec. 260-1 τοῦ (the water) μέν τε προρέοντος ὑπὸ ψηφῖδες ἅπασαι/ὀχλεῦνται[26].

11: ὀπᾷ τε. Vilj. (54-7) rightly argues that this is not a paratactical way of comparing this sentence with the preceding one (e.g. Gild., We.), but that the possibility indicated in v. 9 is followed by the idea of realization, and that this idea is expressed first by an image and then by a more factual description. It should be added that τε has explanatory (specifying) force: see note on *O.* 1, 41.

11: κοινὸν λόγον. Not 'the debt plus the interest' (e.g. Me.), or 'the account between us' (e.g. Farn., Latt., Nassen, 222 n. 9), for Fenn. rightly observes that τίνειν λόγον can hardly mean 'to settle an account'[27]. The meaning is 'an account addressed to the community': cf. Vilj., 44-5, and see my note on *O.* 7, 20-1 ξυνὸν λόγον.

12: φίλαν. 'Friendly' rather than 'welcome' (Sand.; cf. Vilj., 47 n. 65)[28]: the composition of the ode is a friendly office (see above, on 6 ἀλιτόξενον), and this will be answered by a friendly acceptance (see below, on χάριν). Cf. also below, 87 φιλότατι and note *ad loc.*

12: τείσομεν. Not Pindar and the Muse and Aletheia (Gild., Vilj., 44 n. 47, Nassen, 223), but Pindar alone: see note on *O.* 1, 7 αὐδάσομεν. For the desiderative force of the future see note on *O.* 1, 36 φθέγξομαι.

12: χάριν. Vilj. (47-8; followed by Nassen, 223) suggests that three meanings coexist in the word: (1) the charm of the victory ode, (2) the favour of the poet, (3) the gratitude of the victor. But (1) seems unlikely

---

[25] I doubt whether the image implies that "in postponing the production of the poem Pindar feels that he has replenished his powers" (Bowra, 19).

[26] If this interpretation is correct, Hubbard's comment (63), "The later the wave crests, the more magnificent it is, and the more it overshadows petty considerations like pebbles on the strand", becomes inapposite.

Kromer (427) concludes: "Thus the future moves toward the poet just as the river moves toward Achilles and the stream toward the pebble". This is perhaps the most extreme example of her imaginative way of reading the poem, but this kind of metaphilology seems to me worthless and dangerous. Le. is equally wrong in calling the image "un latente richiamo al metodo usato da Herakles per mondare le stalle di Augeas".

[27] This objection is ignored by Th. Horovitz, *Vom Logos zur Analogie* (Zurich 1978), 79, who adopts Me.'s interpretation.

[28] Bo.'s 'to his dear delight' is unclear, just as Nis.'s 'gladly'. Farn.'s 'for a dear friend's sake' is quite impossible.

because there is no parallel for the single word χάρις denoting a beautiful song[29], and (2) is equally improbable because the poet's favour is the source rather than the result (ἐς) of the song[30]. For (3) cf. *O.* 1, 75 ἐς χάριν τέλλεται and my note *ad loc.*[31].

13: γάρ. Vilj. (90) rightly argues that this does not explain χάριν (Me., Wüst, 263, Erbse, 97), but κοινόν. I do not agree, however, with his view that it also refers to τείσομεν (Gild., Fenn.): the main reason why Pindar pays his debt is his devotion to the victor, not his fear of the strictness of the Locrians.

13: Ἀτρέκεια. 'Strictness': see my note on *O.* 3, 12 ἀτρεκής. Vilj. (59, 90) adopts Norwood's suggestion (111-2) that the word contains an ironical allusion to the admonitions of the Locrians urging Pindar to pay his debt[32], but it is more likely to be a stereotype quality, just as Καλλιόπα and Ἄρης. In the present case it refers to strictness in the administration of justice and honesty in commercial intercourse: cf. the testimonies quoted by Wüst, 262-3[33]. For justice as a *topos* in the praise of cities and rulers cf. e.g. *O.* 2, 6, *O.* 13, 6-7, *N.* 4, 12, *I.* 5, 22. If this interpretation is accepted, Hubbard (64) is wrong in classing ἀτρέκεια under τέχνη: he argues that "government is of course a *technē*", but in the present case the spirit of the government is more relevant than its system.

13: Ζεφυρίων. Equivalent to Ἐπιζεφυρίων: cf. fr. 140b, 4-5 οἵ τ' ἀργίλοφον/πὰρ Ζεφυρίου κολώναν, and Vilj., 22-3.

14: Καλλιόπα. Vilj. (91 n. 15) rightly observes that she is not yet the Muse of epic poetry, but represents the Muses in general. He thinks that the poet in covert terms expresses the hope that his song will be appreciated (similarly Nassen, 226). It should be added, however, that artistic sensibility, just as justice and warlike spirit (see below), is a *topos* in the praise of cities and their rulers: see note on *O.* 1, 15 μουσικᾶς.

Hubbard (64) argues that "their care for Ares (which, like athletics, is an activity based upon *physis*) is balanced by care for Calliope (music being the preeminent *technē* which celebrates both war and athletics)".

---

[29] Rumpel quotes v. 78 for the meaning 'carmen victoriale', but see note *ad loc.*

[30] Fenn.'s explanation, "the ode goes beyond cancelling the debt, and is in part a free gift", is unconvincing: in Pindar's conception the payment of the debt is at the same time a free (i.e., a friend's) gift.

[31] We.'s 'als Zins freundlichen Dankes' is unintelligible. Similarly Le. 'in grazia all'amico'.

[32] Similarly Gal., Kromer, 421, 428-9. Le. is certainly wrong in taking the word to include a reference to "un accurato allenamento all'impegno agonistico, e doverosa riconoscenza per chi come Ilas a tale impegno ha amorevolmente provveduto".

[33] Vilj.'s scepsis (90 and n. 11) seems to me unwarranted. See further Nassen, 225-6, and Kromer, 428-9, who goes too far in suggesting a connection between 3 γέγραπται and the fact that Zaleucus was the first to write down legislation.

But Calliope represents appreciation of music (as is admitted by Hubbard, n. 150) rather than technical practice, and as such can hardly "balance" Ares.

15: χάλκεος. A Homeric epithet (E 104 etc.) denoting not only his bronze armour (Ameis-Hentze) but also his strength: cf. LSJ I 2. For the hylozoistic conception of metals cf. my remarks in Lampas 2 (1969), 97.

15: Ἄρης. 'Warlike spirit' (LSJ II 2) is a stereotype element of praise: see note on *O.* 1, 23 ἱπποχάρμαν. Accordingly, I do not believe that the implication is that the Locrians, because they are warlike themselves, will appreciate the warlike character of the myth (Me., Vilj., 91, Nassen, 226-7), nor that "Ares suggests the struggle in athletic ... feats" (Kromer, 429). For the personification of Ἄρης cf. my remarks in Mnem. IV 30 (1977), 80.

15-6. Wil. (220) argues that this detail serves to illustrate the ἀτρέκεια of the Locrians[34], and even concludes that Ἀτρέκεια is especially mentioned for that purpose. This conclusion is rightly rejected by Vilj. (68), but any connection of 15-6 with Ἀτρέκεια seems to me improbable. The force of δέ is inceptive rather than explanatory or adversative: cf. my remarks in Mnem. IV 27 (1974), 173-4, and the references given there[35].

15: τράπε. Stesichorus modifies the story as told in the *Scutum* by adding the detail that Cycnus drove back Heracles as long as he was helped by his father Ares: cf. Vilj., 65-7, who seems right in adopting Robert's explanation that this served to save the honour of Ares. Pindar uses this version not only because Stesichorus was well-known to the Locrians (cf. Schmid, 469-70 n. 3) but also because the mention of Ares serves as a bridge between the introduction and the praise of the victor. For Pindar's use of associative connections cf. Schadewaldt, 43 ff., Vilj., 72 n. 29[36]. The fact that Heracles eventually gained the victory over Cycnus does not allude to some military success of the Locrians, but to some set-back of Agesidamus (Vilj., 66 ff.)[37]: see further below, on 17 Ἴλᾳ.

---

[34] Wüst (263) even suggests that Agesidamus as a true Locrian had asked for an accurate report, and that Pindar, "ein wenig schelmisch", begins by mentioning a painful detail (similarly Erbse, 100).

[35] For inceptive δέ in post-classical Greek cf. P. W. van der Horst, Mnem. IV 32 (1979), 378 ff.

[36] A. Croiset, *Histoire de la littérature grecque*, II (Paris 1890), 398, already called Pindaric composition "un flot toujours renaissant d'images, d'idées, d'émotions qui sortent les unes des autres par de soudaines associations et qui se rattachent entre elles, au point de vue grammatical, par des liaisons les plus simples et les moins logiques".

[37] The parallel suggested by Kromer (430), "Like Herakles, the poet has at first been impended in his task but with divine help will finally complete it", is a mere fabrication.

Hubbard (64) calls the battle between Heracles and Cycnus "another instance of the early/late polarity": this is misleading because Pindar does not say that Heracles gained his victory a long time after his retreat, but only that the latter preceded the former. If we neglect the difference between 'late' and 'later', every sequence of events becomes a polarity.

15: Κύκνεια. For the use of adjectives equivalent to the genitive of a substantive see my note on *O.* 7, 19 'Αργεία.

16: δέ. Has consecutive force and marks the conclusion: see my note on *O.* 7, 31.

17: Ἴλᾳ. His trainer. Vilj. (73 ff.) observes that when trainers are mentioned in Pindar's odes they usually do not occur in conspicuous places. It may be concluded that the help of Ilas was of decisive importance. The scholia suggest that his encouraging incitement during the contest helped the boy to get over some decline. But Vilj. (77 ff.) rightly points out that the help given by Achilles to Patroclus does not refer to a special combat but to the general instruction given to the latter by the former. Vilj. (85) plausibly concludes that Agesidamus had lost a former contest, but had been trained more intensively after that failure[38]. Former failures are also mentioned at *N.* 6, 61-3 and *I.* 3-4, 52-3: the obvious purpose is to set off the present success[39].

17: φερέτω χάριν. Nassen (227) writes that "as we ... remember Pindar's debt to the Lokrians as well as Kyknos' indebtedness to his father for his victory over Herakles, we see now that another victor, Hagesidamos, also has a debt to pay, to Ilas his trainer". These parallels are modern projections unwarranted by the Greek text.

18: ὡς. For the position of ὡς see my note on *O.* 14, 5 καί.

19: Πάτροκλος. For the interest taken by the Locrians in Patroclus cf. Vilj., 77-8 n. 46. I do not believe that "nel parallelo con Patroklos ed Achilleus ... traspare un annuncio del motivo erotico dei versi finali" (Le.): it would have been tasteless to suggest that there existed an erotic relation between the victor and his trainer[40].

---

[38] This seems to me a more obvious explanation than Erbse's suggestion (98) that Agesidamus "die Härte des Trainings zunächst nicht zu ertragen vermochte".

[39] And not to teach the boy to submit to the plain truth, as is maintained by Wil., 220, who wrongly concludes: "Die Wahrheit beherrscht das ganze Gedicht". Erbse (98) similarly speaks of "eine peinliche Demütigung". Hubbard (64) rightly observes that the mention of the drawback serves as a foil to the subsequent success, but wrongly calls this consideration "the obvious Bundyist objection" to a historical interpretation: both Heracles' and Agesidamus' drawbacks were historical realities.

[40] Le. is equally wrong in suggesting that the mention of the Homeric heroes recalls the motif of war (15), and that there are parallels between the gratitude of Agesidamus to Ilas and that of Heracles to Athena (not mentioned in the text!), as well as that of Cycnus to Ares, and that of the poet to the Muse and Aletheia.

20: θήξαις. Schr.'s emendation θάξαις seems unnecessary: cf. Forssman, 129-30. Similarly at *I.* 6, 73 a trainer is called χαλκοδάμαντ' ἀκόναν. Fenn. writes: "P. reconciles the facts of education with his theory of the natural and divine character of all excellence and his depreciation of διδακταὶ ἀρεταί": this is misleading, for θήγω differs from διδάσκω by adding perfection to a pre-existing ability. For the conception of education as perfection of natural qualities cf. *N.* 3, 58, and Gund., 113 n. 60, A. Lesky, N.Jbb. 2 (1939), 364-8.

Hubbard (108) rightly points out that Pindar fully recognized the value, and even necessity, of learning, training, and use of technical methods, but he goes too far in calling φυά "a mere potential" (108) and in concluding that τέχνα "is in the end equally important" (110): the present passage (misunderstood by Hubbard, 110 and n. 9, as referring to poetic celebration) and *N.* 3, 58 (not discussed by Hubbard) show that the two powers are not "caught up in a complementary dialectic" (Hubbard, 108): τέχνα does not actualize φυά, but only further (N.B. *N.* 3, 58 αὔξων) its actualization, so that it has a supplementary rather than a complementary function. It should be added that Hubbard expresses himself more cautiously at p. 64: "Physis must be modified by *technē*: the athlete's physical strength must be properly channeled and disciplined by the trainer's expertise".

20: δέ. Motivates the idea of 'he made him gain the victory' implied in the preceding sentence. For explanatory δέ cf. Denn., 169-70.

20: φύντα. For Pindar's high appreciation of natural abilities (e.g. *O.* 9, 100 τὸ δὲ φυᾷ κράτιστον ἅπαν) cf. Gund., 15 ff., W. Haedicke, *Die Gedanken der Griechen über Familienherkunft und Vererbung* (Diss. Halle 1936), 50-6, Becker, 65-7, Marg (*O.* 1, n. 77), 93-8, F. Heinimann, *Nomos und Physis* (Basel 1945), 99-101.

The participle is used as a substantive: see my note on *O.* 14, 2 λαχοῖσαι.

20: ἀρετᾷ. 'Excellence': see my note on *O.* 3, 18. For the dative of purpose used instead of ἐπί, εἰς, πρός (e.g. Xen. *Mem.* IV 1, 2 εὖ πρὸς ἀρετὴν πεφυκότες) cf. *N.* 7, 7 ἀρετᾷ κριθείς 'chosen for outstanding achievement', Schw. II, 139-40, A. Hoekstra, Mnem. IV 15 (1962), 15 ff., espec. 19-20, where he compares *P.* 4, 61 πεπρωμένον βασιλέα Κυράνᾳ, Hom. A 418 σε κακῇ αἴσῃ τέκον, A. *Ag.* 1341-2 ἀσινεῖ δαίμονι φῦναι.

21: πελώριον. Properly 'gigantic', emphatic for 'great': similarly *P.* 6, 41 ἔργον πελώριον. See further P. Von der Mühll, *Ausgewählte kleine Schriften* (Basel 1975), 436 ff.

21: κλέος. I doubt whether the assonance Πάτροκλος ... κλέος is intentional, as is assumed by Barkhuizen, 52: the name Πάτροκλος does not agree with the idea that Achilles brought him fame.

21: θεοῦ σὺν παλάμαις. Gild., Pu., Bo., Tur., Gal. print παλάμᾳ, but cf. *P.* 1, 48 θεῶν παλάμαις, *N.* 10, 65 παλάμαις Διός. For the distributive force of the plural see my note on *O.* 12, 9 φραδαί.

'With god's help' (Conw.; similarly Pu. *et al.*) is too weak: the proper meaning of παλάμη shows that the gods 'handle' the course of events. Pindar is firmly convinced that the gods play a decisive part in human life: cf. e.g. *O.* 9, 28-9 ἀγαθοὶ δὲ καὶ σοφοὶ κατὰ δαίμον' ἄνδρες/ἐγένοντο, fr. 141 θεὸς ὁ πάντα τεύχων βροτοῖς. Accordingly, σύν denotes a stronger influence than mere cooperation: see my notes on *O.* 1, 110 and *O.* 3, 35. On the other hand, this predominance of the gods does not rule out the possibility of human initiatives: cf. *O.* 3, 38 ἐμὲ ... θυμὸς ὀτρύνει and *O.* 7, 7-8, where a poem is called a 'gift of the Muses', but at the same time a 'product of the (poet's) mind'. This paradox is based on the fact that man's inborn nature (φυά) is determined by the gods: cf. *O.* 11, 10 ἐκ θεοῦ δ' ἀνὴρ σοφαῖς ἀνθεῖ πραπίδεσσιν, *P.* 1, 41-2 ἐκ θεῶν ... ἔφυν. The two powers may be imagined as complementary aspects of one and the same process: cf. *O.* 9, 100-3, where φυᾷ is contrasted with ἄνευ θεοῦ; see further my note on *O.* 3, 4 παρέστα. It should be added, however, that the μαχαναί come from the gods (*P.* 1, 41, *P.* 8, 75-6), which means that the effective realization of human intentions depends on the gods: cf. *O.* 13, 105 ἐν θεῷ γε μὰν τέλος, and see also Hubbard, 118.

The singular θεοῦ should not be translated as 'God': it probably means 'a god' or 'the god in question': see note on *O.* 1, 64 θεόν.

For the juxtaposition ἀνὴρ θεοῦ cf. Fehling, 282, and my note on Hes. *Op.* 155.

22: δέ. Motivates the importance of training (θήξαις): πόνος is the third element (added to human φυά and divine help) necessary to achieve success: cf. *P.* 12, 28-9 εἰ δέ τις ὄλβος ἐν ἀνθρώποισιν, ἄνευ καμάτου/οὐ φαίνεται, *I.* 6, 10-2, etc. See further Gund., 43-4, 116 n. 90, Strohm, 28, R. Pfeiffer, *Ausgewählte Schriften* (Munich 1960), 52-4, Radt, 40, Bowra, 172-3, Köhnken, *Mythos*, Index s.v. Mühe, Gianotti, 17 and n. 49[41].

22: τινες. Reinforces παῦροι: see my note on *O.* 3, 4 ποι.

23: πρό. Commonly taken to mean 'above', but this could only be said of a special joy (cf. Farn. 'such a triumph as sheddeth a lustre over their life beyond all other deeds'), whereas in Pindar's eyes exertion is a precondition of every joy. I therefore prefer Pu.'s translation 'en récompense de': cf. *N.* 5, 48-9 γλυκεῖαν ... μόχθων ἀμοιβὰν/ἐπαύρεο.

23: πάντων. Probably 'all kinds of' rather than 'all': see my note on *O.* 7, 50. In that case ἔργων has a wider meaning than 'victories' (Fenn.).

---

[41] Erbse (98) wrongly concludes "dass der Sieg des Hagesidamos nicht leicht war" (similarly Ang. Bern., 58-9 n. 8): such a hint would be rather tactless in a victory ode.

23: **φάος.** For the imagery of light in Pindar cf. Dorns., *P.S.*, 56-7, Gund., 11 ff., Bowra, 35, and my note on *O.* 1, 23 λάμπει.

24: **ἀγῶνα.** Rumpel, Gild., Fenn. take this to mean 'field for games', but ἐξαίρετον better suits the games themselves: for the pre-eminence of the Olympic games see my notes on *O.* 12, 18 Πυθῶνος and *O.* 1, 7 φέρτερον.

24: **δέ.** See above, p. 54.

24: **θέμιτες.** Vilj. (172) rightly rejects Ehrenberg's suggestion that this refers to an instruction given by Zeus to the poet: θέμις may be an oracle (e.g. *P.* 4, 54), but not a personal instruction. Vilj. (171) prefers the view that the word refers to the games themselves regarded as an 'institution' (similarly Wüst, 259). But (1) only τεθμοί, not θέμιτες, is used in this sense[42], and (2) 'the games urge me to sing the games' is an awkward expression[43]. The most natural solution seems to be the assumption that the institution of the games included the institution of the victory ode: cf. Vilj., 169-70; Gal., who refers to *O.* 8, 78 κὰν νόμον, rightly observes: "se considera el himno al vencedor como un rito". Vilj. (170) objects that tales about the origin of the games did not form an absolute rule for Pindar, but this very observation supports my view: the idea that the victory ode was instituted by Zeus is Pindar's invention, added to the tale of the institution of the games in order to give more weight to their celebration in the song. This addition was facilitated by the fact that Zeus is the father of the Muses and as such the ultimate source of the victory ode: cf. Gianotti, 53-4[44].

24: **ὦρσαν.** The object is 'poets' rather than 'me': for the absolute use of verbs see note on *O.* 1, 29 ἐξαπατῶντι.

24: **ὅν.** C. G. Starr, *Essays on Ancient History* (Leiden 1979), 394, rightly emphasizes the fact that in Pindar's poems myth belongs to a real past. See also my note on *O.* 7, 20 ἐξ ἀρχᾶς[45].

24: **σάματι.** Kromer (430) argues that the grave of Pelops is "a reminder of his existence" and "therefore resembles the pebble-reminder in the first triad". Similarly, she thinks that 25 ἐξάριθμον as a result of calculation recalls 13 Ἀτρέκεια. Using such arguments it would

---

[42] Wüst (263) compares *P.* 11, 9, but Themis there is a goddess.

[43] *O.* 3, 9, *P.* 10, 4, *N.* 1, 7, quoted by Wüst (259), are no convincing parallels.

[44] A. Köhnken, Phoen. 31 (1977), 267 (followed by Slater and Le.), maintains that "Διός should certainly go with ἀγῶνα". He compares *N.* 2, 24 Διὸς ἀγῶνι, but θέμιτες needs some qualification: in *Mythos* (133) he translates 'die Satzungen (des Epinikions)', but such an ellipse seems to me impossible.

Kromer (430) quite arbitrarily draws a parallel between "the laws of Zeus" and "the private law represented by the contract" which prompted Pindar to fulfill his debt.

[45] For a detailed study of the myth of the institution of the Olympic games cf. Wüst, 266 ff. See also Bowra, 160 ff.

be easy to show that anything resembles anything. I shall not tire the reader by discussing Kromer's further speculations.

25: **βωμῷ.** Probably a gloss for σάματι (cf. schol.): for more examples of such glosses cf. Schr., 10. The reading βωμῶν (Gild., Fenn., Pu.) is metrically impossible. Erbse's emendation καμών (Hermes 88 (1960), 23 ff.), adopted by We., Nassen, 228 n. 31, Le., is a term which does not suit the context: the central idea of the story is not toil, but superiority (cf. 39) and success[46]. Christ's πόνων (Farn., Tur., Gal.) is a plausible emendation: cf. the list of the first six victors 64 ff. For the genitive of reference (properly of limitation) see my note on *O.* 7, 59 χώρας. Vilj. (174) doubts whether πόνοι can refer to kinds of contest, but cf. *N.* 6, 24 πόνων ἐγεύσαντο.

26: **Ποσειδάνιον.** Similarly *O.* 2, 13 Κρόνιε παῖ, *O.* 6, 29 Ποσειδάωνι ... Κρονίῳ, Hom. B 528 Τελαμώνιος Αἴας, Kühner-Blass II, 294, Schw. II, 89. See also above, on 15 Κύκνεια.

27: **πέφνε.** This is not an illustration of v. 22 (Vilj., 113), but simply the beginning of Heracles' aretalogy (cf. Wüst, 275-6). For Pindar's "taste for myths with an element of war or violence in them" cf. Bowra, 184, who rightly observes that the poet considers athletic competitors to be enemies: cf. *P.* 8, 82 κακὰ φρονέων, and see my note on Hes. *Op.* 25 κοτέων.

27: **Κτέατον.** He and Eurytus (another son of Poseidon) attacked Heracles on his way to Augeas (their uncle). See further Ang. Bern., 60 ff.

27: **ἀμύμονα.** Not 'physically' (Gild.)[47], but rather referring to noble birth, just as in the case of Aegisthus (Hom. α 29), who was a son of Thyestes.

28: **πέφνε.** For the anaphora cf. Fehling, 193. For the omission of μέν at 27 cf. *id.*, 208.

28: **λάτριον.** 'Due to him for his service', goes with μισθόν. For the use of an adjective equivalent to the genitive of a substantive see above, on 15 Κύκνεια.

29: **ἑκών.** Added in order to emphasize ἀέκοντα: cf. Hom. H 197 οὐ γάρ τίς με βίῃ γε ἑκὼν ἀέκοντα δίηται, ε 155, A. *Sept.* 1033 and Groeneboom *ad loc.*, Fehling, 282-3. See also my notes on Hes. *Th.* 34, Mnem. IV 25 (1972), 240, and *Op.* 155.

---

[46] M. L. West, CQ 20 (1970), 211, proposed πάις (to be connected with Διός), which is still less convincing.

[47] A. Amory Parry, *Blameless Aegisthus* (Leiden 1973), argues that the basic meaning is 'handsome', but see the critical remarks made by S. West, JHS 95 (1975), 193-4, and A. H. M. Kessels, Mnem. IV 31 (1978), 426-7. Cf. also F. M. Combellack, AJP 103 (1982), 361-72.

29: μισθόν. One tenth of the cattle. For the double accusative cf. K.G. I, 324-5, Schw. II, 81-2. See also my note on A. *Pr.* 625 in *Miscellanea ... J. C. Kamerbeek* (Amsterdam 1976), 465.

Vilj. (113) wrongly assumes a parallel between Augeas' debt to Heracles and Pindar's debt to the victor.

29: ὑπέρβιον. Vilj. (174-6) rightly argues that this should not be taken adverbially (Fenn., Nassen, 231) nor belongs to μισθόν (Me., Dorns., We., Latt.), but goes with Αὐγέαν. For the chiasmus cf. Dorns., *P.S.*, 106-7.

30: δέ. Has explanatory (specifying) force: see my note on Hes. *Op.* 9 and the references given there. Cf. also my note on A. *Suppl.* 4, Mnem. IV 38 (1985), 282-3. This use of δέ facilitates the transition of the subordinate sentence (26 ἐπεί) into a main sentence (cf. Vilj., 116 n. 36).

30: Κλεωνᾶν. A hill in Argolis.

30: καί. Wrongly taken by Wüst (276) to be answered by 34 καί: the meaning is 'they, too' (were killed, just as they had killed men of the Tirynthian army), 'in his turn' (Gild.): cf. Hdt. I 134, 3 the Medes ruled τῶν ἄγχιστα οἰκεόντων σφίσι, οὗτοι δὲ καὶ (Legrand wrongly αὖ) τῶν ὁμούρων, Denn., 305.

30: Ἡρακλέης. For the late position of the name see my note on *O.* 14, 4 Χάριτες.

30: ἐφ' ὁδῷ. Not 'en route' (Pu.; similarly Dorns., We. *et al.*), for that is ἐν ὁδῷ, but 'near the road'. Gild.'s explanation, "an offset against the ambush of the Moliones", is confusing: Heracles is more likely to lie in ambush while the Moliones marched on the road. See further Wil., 221 n. 3.

31: Τιρύνθιον. They helped Heracles against Augeas.

32: αὐτῷ. Not possessive (Gal.), but dative of interest: see note on *O.* 1, 23 οἱ.

33: ἥμενον. 'Encamping': cf. Hom. Ο 540, etc.

34: Μολίονες. Named after their mother Molione: cf. Leaf on Λ 709. For the late position of the subject see above, on 30 Ἡρακλέης.

34: καὶ μήν. Has progressive force: cf. Denn., 351-2.

34: ξεναπάτας. Nassen (229-30) maintains that this reminds us of 6 ἀλιτόξενον, and Ang. Bern. (66-7) even thinks that vv. 28-30 "richiamano chiaramente il linguaggio commerciale del proemio". But Nassen herself (n. 37) observes that "the importance of ξενία to the Greeks is emphasized numerous times throughout the odes", and it should be added that a repeated mention of such a common motif need not imply an interconnection.

35: Ἐπειῶν. The oldest population of Elis: cf. Vilj., 156.

35: ὄπιθεν. 'Later': see my note on *O.* 7, 68 ὀπίσω. Hubbard (65)

maintains that Augeas' debt is paid to Heracles "much later": he refers to ὄπιθεν, but he neglects οὐ πολλόν. He further refers to 41 ὕστατος, but see below, note *ad loc*. These points (see also above, on 15 τράπε) might seem unimportant details, but they serve as the basis for Hubbard's general conclusion (69-70), that "Pindar turns inside out the traditional negative valuation of deferment: 'late' things are shown to be the necessary fulfilment, extension, or recompense for the incomplete 'early' things which imply them. This is surely the relevance of the Heracles-myth, with its 'late' vengeance on Augeas ..." (see further below, on 78 ἀρχαῖς). I have tried to show that there is no evidence for such a generalization.

36: **πατρίδα.** Gild. rightly remarks that this should not be taken adjectivally with 38 ἑὰν πόλιν: the latter is an apposition which has pathetic force.

36: **ὑπό.** Properly 'under the pressure of': cf. Hom. O 637 ἐφόβηθεν ὑφ' Ἕκτορι, LSJ B II 1.

36: **στερεῷ.** 'Hard' in the sense of 'ruthless'. Gild. rightly remarks: "στερεῷ almost personifies πυρί". For the conception of fire as a living power cf. Hom Ψ 183 and 216, and my remarks in Lampas 2 (1969), 97-8.

37: **τε.** Couples πυρί and πλαγαῖς, not πατρίδα ... περί and πλαγαῖς ... πόλιν (Fenn.): see above, on 36 πατρίδα.

37: **ὀχετόν.** This does not imply that "the river-bank has yielded" (Gild.): Vilj. (52 n. 86) plausibly assumes that Heracles' army is imagined as a channel running into the city, and that the image ironically recalls the channel made by Heracles to clean Augeas' stable (similarly Wil., 221, Bowra, 260 n. 2). Translations such as 'abîme' (Pu.), 'Abgrund' (We.), 'pit' (Bo., Latt.) are too vague.

38: **ἵζοισαν.** Perhaps an ironical allusion to the image of a town as a ἕδρα (*O.* 14, 1, etc.).

39: **δέ.** Introduces the conclusion: see above, on 16.

39: **κρεσσόνων.** The genitive is subjective rather than objective (Dorns., We., Bo. *et al.*), as appears from ἀποθέσθαι (see below). Cf. Hom. Γ 165 (θεοί), οἵ μοι ἐφώρμησαν πόλεμον πολύδακρυν Ἀχαιῶν, etc. Similarly *N.* 10, 72 χαλεπὰ δ' ἔρις ἀνθρώποις ὁμιλεῖν κρεσσόνων. For the use of maxims in Pindar cf. Bowra, 224-6.

40: **ἀποθέσθαι.** 'Keep off from oneself': cf. Hom. E 492 ἀποθέσθαι ἐνιπήν, LSJ II 2.

41: **ἀβουλίᾳ.** Not 'dans son désarroi' (Pu.), but 'through his thoughtlessness', i.e. because he did not realize that he was dealing with a stronger man (Vilj., 176).

41: **ὕστατος.** Not 'at the last' (Fenn., We., Wüst, 264, Latt., Hub-

bard, 65), but 'as the last' (scil. of Heracles' victims): cf. Vilj., 176-7, who rightly rejects (n. 35) the interpretation of the scholia (ὕστατος ἁλώσιος) adopted by Gal.

42: ἁλώσιος. Not 'capture' of his person (e.g. Farn., We.) or his town (e.g. Vilj., 177-8, Wüst, 264), but by death: cf. *P.* 3, 57-8 ἄνδρ' ἐκ θανάτου κομίσαι/ἤδη ἁλωκότα (scil. θανάτῳ), Hom. Φ 261 θανάτῳ ἁλῶναι, P 506 ἤ κ' αὐτὸς ἐνὶ πρώτοισι ἁλοίη, σ 265 ἤ κέν μ' ἀνέσει θεὸς ἤ κεν ἁλώω.

42: ἀντάσαις. 'Meeting' in the sense of 'receiving': cf. Hom. φ 402 ὀνήσιος ἀντιάσειεν, LSJ I 1. For spatial terminology see note on *O.* 1, 22 προσέμειξε.

42: αἰπύν. 'Overwhelming', 'inescapable': see my note on Hes. *Op.* 83. Cf. also Vilj., 179-81, who compares *N.* 7, 30 κῦμ' 'Αίδα, πέσε δ' ἀδόκητον ἐν καὶ δοκέοντα.

43-5. Nassen (231) writes: "It was with deepest gratitude, then, that the strong (ἄλκιμος, 44) son of Zeus came to Pisa to bestow honor on his father", and then compares 16-9. It may be true that Heracles was grateful to Zeus, but Pindar does not mention his gratitude.

43: ἔλσαις. Not only 'collecting' (LSJ B II) but 'concentrating', viz. for the dedication of the ἀκρόθινα (57): cf. Vilj., 132 n. 34, 150.

45: σταθμᾶτο. 'Marked out', properly by means of a στάθμη 'measuring-line'.

45: ἄλσος. The object has resultative force: cf. νόμισμα κόπτειν, Schw. II, 71. It should be added that ἄλσος in itself does not imply the existence of trees: see my note on *O.* 3, 18.

45: μεγίστῳ. For the supreme position occupied by Zeus cf. Bowra, 45, Fogelmark, 49 ff., H. Schwabl, *Zeus, RE* Suppl. XV (1978), 28 ff.

45: πάξαις. Cf. Lycurg. 73 ὅρους ... πήξαντες. The aorist participle is coincident with διέκρινε: see my note on *O.* 3, 3 ὀρθώσαις.

45: Ἄλτιν. Resultative object: see above, on ἄλσος. Pausanias (V 10, 1) writes that Ἄλτις was the Elean term for ἄλσος, and Barkhuizen (97-8) is undoubtedly right in assuming ἄλσος ... Ἄλτιν to be an 'etymological' pun: cf. *I.* 2, 24-8 'Αλεῖοι ... ἄλσος. On the other hand, I do not believe that the two words are completely synonymous, as is held by Vilj., 183-4, for *O.* 3, 33 τέρμα δρόμου is inside the ἄλσος (18), but obviously outside the Altis, as is pointed out by Fenn.

45: ὅγε. Not emphatic (Vilj., 181 n. 54), but resumptive: cf. *P.* 2, 41, Hom. B 55, etc.

45: ἐν καθαρῷ. Not necessarily a 'clearing' (LSJ; similarly e.g. Le.), but more generally a place not covered by objects which could not be easily removed: cf. Hom. Θ 491, Ψ 61.

46: διέκρινε. Elsewhere 'separate one from another', here 'separate from its surroundings': similarly διορίζω (LSJ I 1).

46: κύκλῳ. 'Surrounding': cf. Xen. *Cyr.* VII 2, 23 κύκλῳ βασιλεῖς.

46: πέδον. Not 'plain' (Farn., We., Le., Nis., *et al.*), but 'area'. D. Young, GRBS 7 (1966), 22, defends the reading δάπεδον, but (1) it is extremely unlikely that this could have a long α (cf. R. Renehan, *Greek Textual Criticism* (Cambridge, Mass. 1969), 117-9), and (2) I do not believe that a palimbacchius (⏑⏑–⏑) can correspond to a bacchius[48].

47: ἔθηκε. 'Made' (LSJ B I 1).

47: δόρπου. A genitive of quality: cf. K.G. I, 264[49].

48: τιμάσαις. Not 'having honoured' (Farn.), but coincident (Gild.): see above, on 45 πάξαις. Vilj. (187 n. 84) objects that the meaning cannot be 'thus doing honour' (Sand.; similarly We.), but we should translate 'while honouring'.

48: πόρον Ἀλφεοῦ. 'The river A.': see note on *O.* 1, 92 πόρῳ.

49: μετά. I doubt whether Alpheus was already received among the twelve gods (schol., Gild.) and therefore prefer to take μετά as equivalent to καί (Wil., 221 and *Gi.* I, 329 n. 3): cf. Thuc. VI 94, 4 ἱππέας ... ἄνευ τῶν ἵππων μετὰ σκευῆς, Pl. *Tim.* 60 a 4 τὸ μὲν τῆς ψυχῆς μετὰ τοῦ σώματος θερμαντικόν, and my note on Pl. *Phd.* 66 b 4, Mnem. IV 6 (1953), 92.

49: δώδεκα. Cf. W. K. C. Guthrie, *The Greeks and their Gods* (London 1950), 110-2, D. Wachsmuth, *KP* 5 (1975), 1567-9.

49: ἀνάκτων. Cf. Hom. μ 290 θεῶν ἀέκητι ἀνάκτων, A. *Suppl.* 222-3 πάντων δ' ἀνάκτων τῶνδε κοινοβωμίαν/σέβεσθε. The original meaning may have been 'protector': cf. Hom. Z 403 Ἀστυάνακτ'· οἶος γὰρ ἐρύετο Ἴλιον Ἕκτωρ, West on Hes. *Th.* 543, but see also *Lex.frühgr. Ep.*, 1462, P. Walcot, ŽA 29 (1979), 25-40.

49-50: πάγον Κρόνου προσεφθέγξατο. Properly 'addressed the hill as the hill of Kronos'. Similarly προσαγορεύω (LSJ II 2-3).

Vilj. (187 ff.) plausibly argues that this is a compromise between the local tradition, according to which there was an old cult of Kronos on the hill (cf. Paus. VI 20, 1), and Pindar's own conception of Zeus as the central god in Olympia (cf. Vilj., 99 ff.). The latter idea even made him say (*O.* 5, 17) that Zeus is 'dwelling on' (ναίων) the hill of Kronos, and made him smuggle away Kronos to the Isles of the Blessed (*O.* 2, 77, where he is denoted as 'Rhea's husband').

51: ἆς. Aeolic-Doric for ἕως.

51: νιφάδι. Vilj. (191-3) rightly rejects the explanations of the scholia, but wrongly adopts Gild.'s suggestion that the bad climate in former times serves to emphasize the contrast between that and the present situa-

---

[48] Ge. on *O.* 1, 80 compares the beginning of *O.* 10, 48 and 90, but that is quite different.

[49] Gal. wrongly calls the genitive "apositivo".

tion (similarly Fenn., Wil., 210 n. 1). Gild. refers to *O.* 3, 24, but the χᾶπος mentioned there is not identical with the hill. The sunshine is more likely to allude to the presence of Zeus: cf. the description of Olympus, Hom. ζ 43-5 οὔτ' ἀνέμοισι τινάσσεται οὔτε ποτ' ὄμβρῳ / δεύεται οὔτε χιὼν ἐπιπίλναται, ἀλλὰ μάλ' αἴθρη / πέπταται ἀννέφελος, λευκὴ δ' ἐπιδέδρομεν αἴγλη. Pindar may even allude to an 'etymological' connection between 'Ολυμπία and Ὄλυμπος. See also note on *O.* 1, 111 εὐδείελος.

51: πρωτογόνῳ. 'Taking place for the first time', but probably with the causative overtone of 'creating the beginning' (of a long series of games): see above, on 4 ὀρθᾷ.

51: τελετᾷ. 'Ceremony': see my note on *O.* 3, 41.

52: μέν. Not answered by 53 τε (Gild., Fenn.), but by 55 δέ: cf. Vilj., 147 n. 12.

52: ἄρα. Not 'as was meet' (Gild.; similarly Pu., Dorns.) or 'as events have proved' (Fenn.), but drawing attention to an important and interesting fact: cf. Denn., 33-4, Ruijgh, 434-5.

52: Μοῖραι. As goddesses of birth (cf. *O.* 6, 42, *N.* 7, 1, etc.), but also implying divine determination and continued existence: cf. Schwenn, 236, Vilj., 145-6. See also note on *O.* 1, 26 Κλωθώ.

53: ἐξελέγχων. Not 'témoin' (Pu.) or 'compute' (Nassen, 232), but 'bringing to light by examination': cf. Vilj., 144 n. 2. For the idea cf. *O.* 1, 33-4 and Ge. *ad loc.*, A. *Suppl.* 993 ἐξελέγχεσθαι χρόνῳ, S. *O.R.* 613-4 and Kamerbeek *ad. loc.*, E. *Hipp.* 1051 and *Ant.* 101, where χρονός is called μηνυτής. This function of Time is a special aspect of its power to bring everything to fulfilment: see note on *O.* 1, 33-4.

54: ἀλάθειαν. Especially the truth of Pindar's story of the establishment of the Olympic games by Heracles (Vilj., 146). This story differed from the—probably traditional—version, which assigned a more important role to Pelops: cf. Vilj., 151 ff., who refers to Bacch. 5, 181 and 8, 31-2[50]. Pindar maintains the idea that Pelops was the heroic protector of the games (see note on *O.* 1, 94-5), but 24 ἀρχαίῳ and 51 Οἰνόμαος clearly imply that he was not the founder[51]. Pindar reinforces his version of the foundation of the games by inserting it into the story of Heracles'

---

[50] Fenn. thinks that "in the course of time an authoritative account of the establishment of the Olympian games by the Theban Hêraklês was evolved out of a mass of conflicting legends", but there are hardly any traces of a cult of Heracles at Olympia.

Nassen (232) argues that "Time is significant here for Pindar, not because it has disclosed to him which account of the origin of the Games is true or the manner in which it was set up, but because Time has borne testimony to the glorious tradition of the Olympian Games from its early inception to this very moment when Pindar bestows honor on the son of Archestratos", but this view does not suit the context.

[51] Accordingly, Wil. (221) is wrong in writing: "die Unvereinbarkeit ist dem Pindar nicht bewusst geworden". Cf. also Bowra, 164.

exploits: Ang. Bern. (58 and n. 6) observes that this connection is absent from the reports of the ancient mythographers. For the prominent position given by Pindar to Heracles see my note on *O.* 3, 16 λόγῳ.

For the importance attached by the poet to truth see above, on 4 Ἀλάθεια. I do not believe, however, that the two passages have an inner connection, as is suggested by Gild., Fenn., Wil., 219, Gund., 53-4, Vilj., 148 and 150, Erbse, 101-2, Nassen, 232: Pindar first emphasizes the truthfulness of his promise, and now the truth of his story. See also above, on 8 καταίσχυνε.

54: **ἐτήτυμον.** Does not mean that "truth to impression is proved to be truth to reality" (Gild.), but alludes to the 'etymology' of ἀλάθεια (Norwood, 252 n. 43, Barkhuizen, 48-9): cf. A. *Cho.* 948-50 ἐτήτυμος / Διὸς κόρα, Δίκαν δέ νιν / προσαγορεύομεν. Vilj. (146 n. 10) rightly objects that Norwood's explanation, 'Truth which does indeed repel oblivion', is irrelevant to the context, but Pindar rather thinks of 'unconcealed' (see above, on 4 Ἀλάθεια): cf. ἐξ- in ἐξελέγχων and *N.* 5, 17 φαίνοισα πρόσωπον ἀλάθεια. The poet suggests that the truth about the foundation of the Olympic games has always been obscure, but has been brought to light at last (Χρόνος).

55: **Χρόνος.** Not "because it [the Olympic festival] was predestined to last through all time" (Farn.), but because Time reveals, and thereby fulfils, the truth: see above, on 7 χρόνος[52].

Ang. Bern. (56) thinks that Time and the Moirai "conferiscono prestigio e venerabilità non solo alla πρωτόγονος τελετά, ma anche alla sua reiterazione nel tempo e al suo svolgimento attuale", but the context shows that they have a more limited function.

55: **δέ.** Introduces a specification: see above, on 30.

55: **σαφανές.** Not 'clear' (most translations), but 'reliable', 'certain': cf. *O.* 6, 20 σαφέως μαρτυρήσω, *N.* 11, 43-4 σαφὲς ... τέκμαρ, and see further my note on *O.* 7, 91 σάφα. I do not believe that the word is used adverbially or predicatively (Dorns., Pu., *et al.*), for the accusative of single τό is always adverbial in Pindar: cf. E. des Places, *Le pronom chez Pindare* (Paris 1947), 41-2. Accordingly, τὸ σαφανές has the objective sense of 'the certain fact' (cf. Thuc. I 22, 4 τῶν γεγενημένων τὸ σαφὲς σκοπεῖν), and ὀπᾷ κτλ. is epexegetical (Vilj., 144 n. 3): the deictic force of τό points forward to it.

55: **κατέφρασεν.** For the intensifying force of κατα- see my note on Hes. *Op.* 234.

56: **ὀπᾷ.** Equivalent to ὅπως: cf. Vilj., 148 n. 15.

56: **τάν.** Explained by Vilj. (194) as 'suitable to the circumstances and

---

[52] Bernard (81 n. 73) arbitrarily assumes an 'etymological' allusion to 50 Κρόνου.

obvious', but K.G. I, 581 (d), to which he refers, does not contain convincing parallels. The deictic force of the article here has the weaker sense of 'the above-mentioned' (cf. 44 λᾶαν): cf. K.G. I, 597 ('anaphorisch').

56: πολέμοιο. Bond on E. *H.F.* 477 points out that "ἀκροθίνια is normally used with an indication of origin, of the θίς from which the top portion is dedicated". But in the phrase πολέμοιο δόσιν the genitive is subjective rather than a genitive of origin (Vilj., 194): cf. *O.* 7, 7 Μοισᾶν δόσιν.

57: ἀκρόθινα. If this is taken to stand in apposition to δόσιν (e.g. Dorns., Farn.) or to depend on διελών (Vilj., 194-5), the latter has to be translated as 'having separated' (scil. from the rest of the booty)[53]. But there are no convincing parallels for διαιρέω 'to set apart' (as is assumed by Vilj., 195 n. 127). If the verb has its common meaning 'to divide', the object must be δόσιν, ἀκρόθινα depending on ἔθυε (Pu., Bo., We.). The sequel shows that the division served to reserve a considerable part of the booty for the foundation of the games. The participle, as is often the case in Greek, expresses the main idea: see my note on *O.* 3, 4 εὑρόντι. On the other hand, Hubbard (65) goes much too far in concluding that "his late destruction of Augeas and *the* [my italics] old order provides the basis ... for the construction of a new order—that of the Olympic festival".

For the intertwined position of the words cf. Dorns., *P.S.*, 107 ff.

57: πενταετηρίδα. Taken by Vilj. (148, 196) as a predicate, but this does not suit the meaning of ἔστασεν ('he instituted').

57: ἄρα. See above, on 52 ἄρα.

58: σύν. 'At the occasion of': for this temporal use of σύν cf. *P.* 8, 7 καιρῷ σὺν ἀτρεκεῖ, *P.* 11, 10 ἄκρᾳ σὺν ἑσπέρᾳ, fr. 123, 1 σὺν ἁλικίᾳ, Bacch. 10, 23 κείνῳ σὺν ἅματι.

59: νικαφορίαισι. Not 'lo que uno se lleva (φέρω) como consecuencia de la victoria (νίκα)' (Gal.), but cf. Hom. Σ 308 φέρῃσι μέγα κράτος, LSJ φέρω A VI 3.

59: τε. 'Belonging to this first festival': cf. Hom. A 45 τόξ' ὤμοισιν ἔχων ἀμφηρεφέα τε φαρέτρην, Denn., 497, J. Gonda, Mnem. IV 7 (1954), 190.

60: τίς. The question is not addressed to a special person: cf. Vilj., 121, who compares *P.* 4, 70-1, *I.* 5, 43 ff.

60: ποταίνιον. 'New', i.e. the first.

63: ἐν δόξᾳ θέμενος. Vilj. (197-8) convincingly argues that δόξᾳ means 'expectation' (contrasting with ἔργῳ), not 'glory' (e.g. Dorns., Wüst,

---

[53] Gild.'s view, that ἀκρόθινα refers to Heracles' share, is obviously wrong.

257, 264)[54]. It should be added that the use of ἐν ... θέμενος is based on the Homeric phrase ἐν φρεσὶ θέσθαι (N 121, δ 729)[55].

63: εὖχος. 'Glorious victory': cf. *P*. 5, 21 εὖχος ἑλών, *N*. 6, 67 γαρύων εὖχος. For the objective use ('thing boasted of' cf. ἄχος 'grievous event' (A. *Pers*. 259), ἔλεγχος 'object of criticism' (Hom. E 787), etc.

63: καθελών. Not 'fetch down' (LSJ IV), for κατα- has intensifying force: see above, on 55 κατέφρασεν. No comma should be printed after εὖχος, which depends on both participles.

64 ff. Vilj. (122-3) plausibly suggests that this catalogue compensates for the lack of former achievements in the victor's life and that of his family. He also points out (121-2) the interest taken by the Greeks in events belonging to the remote past[56]. See further G. Huxley, *Pindar's Vision of the Past* (Belfast 1975), 38-40.

The style of the list is not "flat and dull" (Farn.): cf. Vilj., 123-4 n. 56.

64: στάδιον. Properly 'race-course', but also the race itself: cf. Hdt. V 22, 2 ἀγωνιζόμενος στάδιον, Xen. *HG* I 2, 1 ἐνίκα ... στάδιον. Similarly *N*. 8, 16. The accusative is to be explained as an apposition to the unexpressed internal object of ἀρίστευσεν: see my note on *O*. 7, 16 ἄποινα.

64: εὐθύν. As opposed to the δίαυλος.

64: τόνον. Farn. defends the transmitted but unmetrical reading εὐθύτονον by arguing that τόνος never means 'course', but cf. Plut. *Dem*. 13, and English 'stretch', Germ. 'Strecke'. For the *accusativus viae* cf. K.G. I, 312-3, Schw. II, 69.

65: ποσσί. The pleonasm makes the description more graphic: cf. A. *Pers*. 516 ποδοῖν ἐνήλου, Bruhn, § 226. See further Schadewaldt, 49-50, Illig, Index s.v. Anschaulichkeit.

65: Λικυμνίου. Great-uncle of Tlepolemus: cf. *O*. 7, 29.

66: Οἰωνός. The schol. suggest that his name alludes to his swiftness: cf. Vilj., 165.

66: Μιδέαθεν. Midea was a place in Argolis.

66: στρατὸν ἐλαύνων. As a helper of Heracles, who was his first cousin. See further Vilj., 164-5.

66: πάλᾳ. Dative of limitation: see note on *O*. 1, 87 πτεροῖσιν.

66: κυδαίνων. Most translators seem to supply ἦν as the main verb, but I prefer to supply ἀρίστευσε (or ἐνίκα: Wil., 222 n. 1) and to take ὁ

---

[54] Similarly E. Suárez de la Torre, CFC 7 (1974), 241-8: cf. E. Thummer, Anz. Alt.wiss. 35 (1982), 144.

[55] The use of τίθημι in the sense of 'to propose as prize', compared by Fenn., is completely different.

[56] Nassen (233) again invents a unifying idea by assuming that each victor "has devoted his will and strength to the attainment of success" and "has excelled ... just as Herakles" (similarly 239).

as a demonstrative announcing Ἔχεμος: cf. *P.* 4, 174 τῶν μὲν ... Εὐφάμου τε ... σόν τε, *N.* 5, 38 μιν ... θεόν, K.G. I, 658. In that case πάλᾳ belongs to ἀρίστευσε, not to κυδαίνων[57].

67: ἔφερε. 'Gained': see above, on 59 νικαφορίαισι. The use of the imperfect is "graphic" (Fenn.) because it views the action in its perspective: cf. W. F. Bakker, *The Greek Imperative* (Amsterdam 1966), 24-7.

67: τέλος. 'Prize': cf. *P.* 9, 118, *I.* 1, 27, LSJ III 2 b.

69: ἀν' ἵπποισι. 'On a chariot': cf. Ge. on *O.* 1, 41.

70: ὁ Ἁλιροθίου. For the synizesis cf. *P.* 9, 38 χλοαρόν, *N.* 2, 12 Ὠαρίωνα, Schr., 25. Halirrothius was a son of Poseidon, "and so an hereditary charioteer" (Gild.).

71: ἄκοντι. Denn. (164) observes that "in some cases, connexion is varied with asyndeton", but a single asyndeton in a series connected by δέ seems more exceptional than a single δέ in a series of asyndeta (e.g. Ar. *Lys.* 547). It is true that we find μὲν ... δὲ ... asyndeton ... δέ at Arist. *Top.* 105 a 23-5, but this is not a convincing parallel, because Aristotle's style is quite different from Pindar's. So we should perhaps accept ἄκοντι δέ given by all MSS. and explain the imperfect responsion from the metrical compulsion of the proper name (cf. 68 Τίρυνθα).

71: Φράστωρ. The fact that his descent is not mentioned implies that the name is a fiction, just as that of Νικεύς (72): cf. Vilj., 165, Barkhuizen, 57, who seems to me to go too far, however, in maintaining that 59 νικαφορίαισι "leads up to" the name Νικεύς. Φράστωρ obviously alludes to his ability of fixing the eye on the target.

71: σκοπόν. This kind of javelin-throwing is also alluded to at *O.* 13, 94 and *N.* 9, 55. It is further mentioned in Antiphon's second Tetralogy.

72: μᾶκος. 'A long distance': for the use of *abstractum pro concreto* see my note on *O.* 7, 5 κᾶδος. Similarly S. *Ant.* 446 εἰπέ μοι μὴ μῆκος. The accusative may be called 'locative' (cf. K.G. I, 312-3)[58], but properly it is to be explained as an apposition to the unexpressed internal object of ἔδικε: see above, on 64 στάδιον.

72: πέτρῳ. The discus was originally made of stone: cf. Hom. θ 190, Vilj., 163 n. 9.

72: χέρα κυκλώσαις. Cf. Hom. θ 199 τόν ῥα περιστρέψας ἧκε στιβαρῆς ἀπὸ χειρός.

72: ὑπέρ. 'Beyond', in the sense of 'further than' (cf. *N.* 3, 21) rather than 'better than' (cf. *N.* 9, 54, *I.* 2, 36), because μᾶκος needs a qualification.

---

[57] P. Maas' emendation ἐπάλαι(ε), *Kleine Schriften* (Munich 1973), 21, is obviously unnecessary.

[58] Not an accusative of reference (Fenn.).

72: συμμαχία. Equivalent to σύμμαχοι: cf. LSJ II, and see above, on 72 μᾶχος. For the idea see above, on 66 στρατόν. Vilj. (110) suggests that the word denotes the whole crowd of spectators, all of whom were Heracles' allies, but this is unlikely from a psychological point of view.

73: παραίθυξε. Cf. 81 ὀρσικτύπου, Hom. Φ 313 ὀρυμαγδὸν ὄρινε, Nonn. 31, 382 κτύπον αἰθύσσειν. For the synaesthesia see note on *O.* 1, 23 λάμπει. The meaning of παρ- is not that 'the cheer flashed by' (Gild.; similarly Fenn., Vilj., 110), but 'from aside' (where they stood watching the contest): cf. Ap. Rh. 2, 1253 (the eagle of Zeus flying over the ship) λαίφεα πάντ' ἐτίναξε παραιθύξας πτερύγεσσιν.

73: ἐν. Not 'meanwhile' (Fenn.)[59], for a pancration lasting into the night (Paus. V 9, 3) obviously was an exception. Me. translates 'den Abend bestrahlte' (similarly Gild., Dorns., Bo., Wüst, 257), but such a use of ἐμφλέγω seems to be unparalleled. 'Among the spectators' (Vilj., 111) is equally improbable. I prefer to take the original meaning 'at the same occasion' in the weakened sense of 'in addition': cf. *Dith.* 2, 9-10 ῥόμβοι τυπάνων, / ἐν δὲ κέχλαδεν κρόταλα, S. *Aj.* 675, *O.R.* 181, Hdt. I 185, 1.

73: ἕσπερον. Vilj. (110 n. 17) rightly argues that this is the object of ἔφλεξεν, not an adjective belonging to φάος (schol. 90 d, Dorns.).

74: εὐώπιδος. The full moon was shining when Heracles established the games: cf. *O.* 3, 19-20. Nassen (233) writes that the full moon "fixes a steady spotlight on the victor". This may be true, but it does not indicate the reason why the moon is mentioned by Pindar. Nassen then takes a further step into the realm of fantasy by continuing: "With the fair-faced moon beaming down on him from above, he now has that inner light of life, too (as the gnomic sentiment of lines 22-23 describes it), as his reward for achievement".

76: ἀείδετο. Fenn.'s 'is besung' (cf. E. *I.T.* 367 αὐλεῖται δὲ πᾶν μέλαθρον 'is be-fluted') does not explain the construction. K.G. (I, 126-7) observe that the internal object of intransitive verbs can be made the subject of the sentence (e.g. Xen. *HG* V 2, 34 ὥστε ἐκεῖθεν πάντα ὑπηρετεῖσθαι), and that the present case is a "free" extension of that use. It is more correct to say that τέμενος is an apposition to the unexpressed 'internal subject' of ἀείδετο (see above, on 64 στάδιον): the place is so full of the sound that they virtually coincide.

76: θαλίαις. Not instrumental (Gal.)[60], but 'on the occasion of' (see note on *O.* 1, 50 ἀμφί), hence 'during'. Similarly Hes. *Op.* 231 θαλίῃς.

---

[59] Pu.'s 'mais voici que' and Nis.'s 'and then' are unclear. Latt.'s 'into that evening' is rightly called "absurd" by Vilj., 111 n. 19.

[60] Le.' 'canti festori' is impossible. I do not believe that 76-7 alludes to the symposium at which *O.* 11 was performed, as is suggested by Vilj., 9.

77: τόν. 'Belonging to' (the feast): see my note on *O.* 12, 5 αἱ.

77: ἀμφί. Fenn.'s note, "there clearly = 'according to', though the notion of 'round about', 'on both sides of', may still be maintained", is misleading, for (1) there are no parallels for ἀμφί 'according to', and (2) the singing was not "of various character, but all approaching from one quarter or another the style of the enkômion" (Fenn.): τρόπος is the musical mode appropriate to a special subject (see my notes on *O.* 14, 5 τά τε and 17 Λυδῷ), and the mode of the victory song is imagined to form the centre around which the whole activity of singing moves: cf. Vilj., 105 n. 5, who compares *P.* 2, 15 κελαδέοντι ἀμφὶ Κινύραν.

78: ἀρχαῖς. Not 'the beginnings of the earliest songs' (Farn.; similarly We., *et al.*), for Vilj. (94-6) rightly points out (1) that in that case Pindar would have mentioned Zeus at the beginning of the present ode, and (2) that προτέραις cannot be equivalent to προτέρων ἀοιδῶν (cf. also Wüst, 265). The meaning is 'the tradition which started at the first games', and Pindar obviously implies that the important role assigned by him to Zeus was a traditional element of the victory ode: cf. Vilj., 92-4. It is true that the phrase ἐπωνυμίαν χάριν νίκας implies that the celebration of the victor, too, forms part of the tradition (Hubbard, 65), but Hubbard (70) goes much too far in concluding that the " 'early' establishment of the Olympic festival ... finds its 'late' fulfilment in the present celebration of Hagesidamus": see above, on 35 ὄπιθεν.

78: νυν. 'In the present case' rather than 'at this moment': see above, on 9 νῦν[61]. For the enclitic form used in spite of the emphatic meaning see my note on *O.* 3, 34.

78: ἐπωνυμίαν. 'Deriving its name from': cf. *P.* 1, 30-1 τοῦ μὲν ἐπωνυμίαν ... πόλιν, K.G. I, 375. Ang. Bern. (55) wrongly suggests that the word refers to the name of the victor, which is added to those of the first victors.

78: χάριν. Apposition to the unexpressed internal object of κελαδησόμεθα: see my note on *O.* 7, 16 ἄποινα. Similarly *O.* 11, 13-4 κόσμον ... κελαδήσω, *I.* 8, 62 μνᾶμα πυγμάχου κελαδῆσαι, *Pae.* 7 b, 5 κελαδήσαθ' ὕμνους. The meaning is not 'ornament' (Rumpel, Vilj., 93), 'honour' (Gild., Dorns., Farn., We., Le.)[62], or 'thanks' (Wüst, 257, Erbse, 99), for in such cases Pindar uses the dative (cf. *P.* 11, 10-2), but 'joy' expressed in a victory ode: cf. Fenn. and Gal., and see my note on *O.* 7, 5 χάριν.

Nassen (235) thinks that "the favor of Zeus is represented here by the fitting emblem, the thunderbolt" and that "Pindar speaks of it as 'favor

[61] Nis.'s 'even now' is unintelligible.
[62] Similarly Bowra, 232 'tribute'.

that bears the name to be attached to the proud victory' ". This is quite impossible both from a grammatical and a logical point of view.

79: **νίκας.** Belongs to ἐπωνυμίαν (see above) as well as to χάριν (cf. Wüst, 265): in the latter case the meaning of the genitive is 'because of' (cf. K.G. I, 390-1) or (more probably) 'originating from': cf. LSJ χάρις IV 1.

79: **κελαδησόμεθα.** The future has desiderative force: see note on *O.* 1, 36 φθέγξομαι[63]. For the meaning of the plural see above, on 12 τείσομεν[64]. For the 'auditory display' see note on *O.* 1, 3 γαρύεν.

79: **βροντάν.** For the juxtaposition of internal and external accusative Fenn. compares *O.* 7, 15-6 and *P.* 1, 97. Me. refers to E. *H.F.* 687-9, but see Bond *ad loc.*, who more aptly compares *I.A.* 1468. Bowra (232) thinks that the transitive use of κελαδέω "seems to be a special mannerism of Pindar", but cf. LSJ II.

80: πυρπάλαμον. Not 'fiery and hurled by hand' (Pu., Gal., We., Le., Nis.), 'hurled by a fiery hand' (Gild., Vilj., 96)[65], 'with hand of fire' (Fenn., who compares *O.* 4, 1 βροντᾶς ἀκαμαντόποδος; similarly Latt.), 'cunningly wrought from fire' (LSJ: cf. E. *Or.* 820 πυριγενὴς παλάμη), but 'hurling fire' (Me.): cf. E. fr. 781, 68-9 κεραύνιαί τ' ἐκ Διὸς / πυρίβολοι πλαγαί, A. *Pr.* 917 τινάσσων τ' ἐν χεροῖν πύρπνουν βέλος. Vilj. (97) objects that this interpretation "lends too much force to -πάλαμον", but the lightning is obviously personified, just as at *Pr.* 917[66].

81: ὀρσικτύπου. Vilj. (102-3) points out that this aspect is emphasized because it belongs to the Zeus of Olympia (cf. e.g. *O.* 4, 1, *O.* 6, 81), not because the thunderbolt is represented on the coins of Locri.

82: ἅπαντι. Not 'highest' (Gal.)[67], but equivalent to παντοίῳ: see above, on 23 πάντων.

82-3: ἐν ... κράτει ... ἀραρότα. Vilj. (97) argues that this refers to the hand of Zeus, but his explanation, "a basis which entirely consists of fire", is obviously impossible. Gild.'s translation 'in every victory fit emblem' (similarly Fenn., LSJ B 2, Bo., Le.) is improbable because the thunderbolt is a means, not a symbol, of victory. Me.'s 'dem Allgewalt innewohnt' (similarly Dorns., Pu., We., Wüst, 257, Nis.) seems the most convincing interpretation: cf. ἀραρώς with dative 'provided with': *I.* 2, 19, Hom. O 737, LSJ B III. Vilj. (98) objects that the power is in

---

[63] Gild. seems to me wrong in following the schol. who takes the form to be a subjunctive (cf. Vilj., 92 n. 1).

[64] I fail to see why the plural here should "refer exclusively, or at least primarily, to poet and victor" (Hubbard, 147).

[65] 'Fire-flung' (Bo.) is unclear.

[66] Dorns.'s 'feuerbringend' is too weak.

[67] He compares S. *Phil.* 142 πᾶν κράτος, but there the proper meaning is 'complete' (Jebb).

the thunderbolt, not conversely, But ἐν simply emphasizes the fact that the thunderbolt is *closely* joined to every kind of victory, i.e., that it easily achieves any victory.

84: χλιδῶσα. 'Swelling', hence 'loudly sounding': cf. *O.* 9, 2 καλλίνικος κεχλαδώς, and Vilj., 60 n. 113, who rightly rejects LSJ's 'soft', 'delicate'. For the 'auditory display' see above, on 79 κελαδησόμεθα. Kaimio (160) thinks that the word refers to "the general magnificence and refinement of the performance".

84: δέ. Has specifying force: see above, on 30 δέ.

84: πρός. Has been added to emphasize the reciprocal character of the action: cf. LSJ C I 6.

84: μελέων. Does not refer to the melodies of the κάλαμος (Wüst, 257, Latt.), but defines μολπά (cf. also Vilj., 61 n. 114). The plural has amplifying force (Vilj., 61 n. 115): see my note on *O.* 3, 6 στέφανοι.

85: εὐκλέϊ. Probably has a causative overtone: cf. *O.* 2, 90 εὐκλέας ὀϊστούς, and see above, on 4 ὀρθᾷ, and note on *O.* 1, 105 κλυταῖσι.

85: Δίρκᾳ. Pindar mentions the spring instead of the town (Thebes) in order to suggest that his song is divinely inspired and has the power of making the victor immortal. For water as the substance of life and as a vehicle of poetic inspiration see above, on 10 κῦμα, and my note on *O.* 7, 2 ἀμπέλου. For the reference to divine sources cf. also Gianotti, 112.

85: χρόνῳ. 'Late': cf. S. *Ph.* 1041, E. *H.F.* 740, LSJ I 3 c. I doubt whether the phrase recalls Χρόνος at 7 and 55, as is assumed by Vilj., 61 n. 116, and Nassen, 235, who writes: "Time, coming upon him from afar (cf. 7), has caught up with him at last": the rather casual χρόνῳ should not be loaded with such a pregnant meaning[68].

85: φάνεν. Cf. Hom. θ 499 φαῖνε δ' ἀοιδήν. A plural verb after a plural neuter usually emphasizes the latter's plurality (cf. K.G. I, 66, Vilj., 61 n. 115), but in the present case to say that "we distinguish the strains" (Gild.) is a far-fetched explanation. Pindar perhaps suggests that more back work was waiting.

86: ἀλλά. For μὲν ... ἀλλά cf. Denn., 5, Bury, *Isthmian Odes*, 154. Accordingly, a comma, not a semi-colon, should be put at the end of 85.

86: ὥτε. For similes used by Pindar cf. Bowra, 239-40.

86: παῖς. Scil. φαίνεται.

86: ἀλόχου. Γνησίας γυναικὸς καὶ οὐ παλλακίδος (schol.). Gal.'s 'una mujer sin hijos' is impossible: he compares Pl. *The.* 149 b 10, but there ἄλοχος seems to have been coined by Plato to contrast with λοχεία.

---

[68] Similarly Kromer (428) unduly dramatizes the situation by suggesting that just as Time is threatening the poet at 7-8, "the passage of time would have become increasingly threatening to the victor and his deeds if the song had not been written".

87: τὸ πάλιν. The translation 'the opposite' (Me., Dorns., Fenn., *et al.*) is unparalleled[69]. The meaning is 'the return', and the image is based on the conception of human life as a δίαυλος: cf. E. *H.F.* 662 and Bond *ad loc*[70]. For τὸ πάλιν 'turn' cf. E. *H.F.* 777 χρόνου τὸ πάλιν.

Vilj. (62-3) goes too far in concluding that the father is very old (similarly Gal., who speaks of a litotes), although he is right in arguing that the primary purpose of the simile is not to emphasize the long waiting (which has been indicated by χρόνῳ), but the joy for the fulfilment of the desire.

87: δέ. Has specifying force: see above, on 30 δέ.

87: τοι. Most editors adopt Boeckh's emendation οἱ, but Tur. is probably right in retaining τοι: for δέ τοι cf. e.g. *P.* 5, 12, *P.* 8, 59, Denn., 552.

87: θερμαίνει. The subject is the father, not the son (as is commonly assumed): for θερμαίνει νόον equivalent to θερμαίνεται cf. A. *Cho.* 1004 θερμαίνοι φρένα, Ar. *Ran.* 844 σπλάγχνα θερμήνῃ κότῳ, *P.* 1, 11-2 ἰαίνει καρδίαν κώματι. For the association of the idea of heating with pleasing see my note on *O.* 7, 43 θυμὸν ἰάναιεν.

87: φιλότατι. Although the composition of the victory ode is an act of friendship (see above, on 12 φίλαν), I do not believe that φιλότατι is "intentionally ambiguous" (Vilj., 61 n. 118): the newly born child can hardly be said to love its father, nor can the poem symbolized by the child be said to love the victor. Accordingly, I do not believe either that the passage expresses "etwas von der Herzlichkeit des Verhältnisses zwischen ihm [Pindar] und Hagesidamos" (Wüst, 265-6)[71]: the victor desired an ode and he is enthusiastic about the result. The father's love of the child obviously implies a self-compliment on the part of the poet: for Pindar's self-confidence see my notes on *O.* 1, 116 πρόφαντον, *O.* 3, 4 νεοσίγαλον and *O.* 7, 8 καρπὸν φρενός.

88: πλοῦτος. The silent presupposition is that the victor's fame is just as important as a man's property: the proper celebration of the victor's fame secures his immortality, just as a proper heir secures the continuance of the family-estate: cf. Vilj., 63, Hubbard, 63 (whose interpretation of the victory ode as a "recipient of *ploutos*" seems to me to push the comparison too far). Pindar probably alludes to Πλοῦτος as a name of Hades: cf. 91 'Αΐδα, *I.* 1, 67-8, and Barkhuizen, 19.

---

[69] Fenn. compares *O.* 12, 11 ἔμπαλιν τέρψιος, but even τὸ ἔμπαλιν always has adverbial force.

[70] The translation 'wenn er über die Jugend schon hinaus ist' (We.; similarly Nis.) is inaccurate.

[71] Quoted with approval by Erbse, 102. He refers to 97 ff., but that is another matter.

88: λαχών. Properly ποιμὴν λαγχάνει πλοῦτον, but Pindar likes to invert the positions of object and subject: see note on *O.* 1, 53 ἀκέρδεια λέλογχεν.

88: ποιμένα. 'Manager': cf. LSJ II 1. The implication is that the poet watches over the victor's fame: cf. *O.* 11, 9.

89: ἐπακτόν. 'Alien' (LSJ I 1) suggests 'the wrong man': cf. S. *Aj.* 1296, E. *Ion* 592.

89: ἀλλότριος. 'Foreign', i.e. belonging to another family (Vilj., 63), specifies ἐπακτόν (Vilj. wrongly explains the asyndeton by 'and in addition').

91: καὶ ὅταν. Vilj. (64) rightly argues that this does not answer 86 ὥτε but only ἐπεὶ κτλ. For 'also' introducing the main idea see my note on *O.* 7, 7 καί. Gal.'s 'tanbién' is not correct.

92: Ἀΐδα. For the form of the genitive see my note on *O.* 3, 31 Βορέα.

92: σταθμόν. Not 'farmstead' (Vilj., 61, Wüst, 258), but 'dwelling' (LSJ I 2).

93: πνεύσαις. Does not only refer to toil (Gild.)[72] but also (cf. Wüst, 266), and even primarily, to aspiration and ambition: cf. *P.* 11, 30, *N.* 3, 41, LSJ V 2. See further Onians, 55.

93: μόχθῳ. Gild. *et al.* (cf. Vilj., 62 n. 119) speak of 'semi-personification', but it should be added that Pindar again uses the mannerism of transposing subject and object: see above, on 88 λαχών. For the idea of toil as a *topos* see above, on 22 δέ.

93: βραχύ. For the contrast 'short-long' cf. Hubbard, 27-32, espec. 31.

93: τι. Reinforces βραχύ: see above, on 22 τινες.

93: ἀδυεπής. For 'speech' indicating musical sound see my note on *O.* 3, 8 ποικιλόγαρυν. For ἀδύς and γλυκύς as favourite qualifications in Pindar see my note on *O.* 7, 8 γλυκύν.

93: λύρα. For the combination of lyre and flute see my note on *O.* 3, 8 αὐλῶν. Fenn. wrongly concludes from 84 κάλαμον that "this ode was sung to the flute only".

94: ἀναπάσσει. For the use of the singular (indicating the unity of the music) Fenn. compares *O.* 5, 15. The verb alludes to the custom of strewing victors with flowers (cf. Ar. *Nub.* 1330) and covering them with garlands (Ar. *Eq.* 502).

94: χάριν. Not 'hommage' (Pu., We.)[73], or 'grace' (Farn., Vilj., 64, Nis.) or 'beauty' (Latt.)[74], but 'Freude' (Dorns.), 'delight' (Bo.): see my note on *O.* 7, 5 χάριν.

---

[72] We.'s 'vergebens atmend' is unintelligible.

[73] And certainly not 'Dank' (Wüst, 258, Erbse, 99).

[74] Nassen (237) even thinks that the word means both 'favour' and 'beauty'.

95: τρέφοντι. For the image of fame as a growing plant see my note on *O.* 12, 15 κατεφυλλορόησεν. For the idea that a victory ode is essential to the realization of a victory see my note on *O.* 7, 11 ζωθάλμιος, and cf. also S. Gzella, Eos 58 (1969-70), 172-3.

95: εὐρύ. The predicate has resultative force: see my note on *O.* 3, 15 μνᾶμα. For the meaning 'widely extending' see my note on *O.* 1, 42 εὐρυτίμου.

Hubbard (67 n. 162) rightly remarks that "Pindar seems not to have doubted that his odes would receive wide circulation beyond their original audience", and that this self-confidence presupposes "the certainty of written presentation and dissemination".

96: Πιερίδες. Born in Pieria: cf. Hes. *Th.* 53 and West *ad loc.*

97: συνεφαπτόμενος. For the idea of cooperation between man and god see my note on *O.* 3, 4 παρέστα and above, on 21 θεοῦ.

97: σπουδᾷ. Not 'speedily' (Farn.), but 'with zeal', 'eagerly': cf. Vilj., 92 n. 19. Nassen's comment (237-8), "He has displayed the same eagerness (σπουδᾷ) to grant full payment to his patron as Herakles once showed in his endeavor to collect the wages owed to him (cf. 29)", is an absurd addition.

98: ἀμφέπεσον. For the transition from 'embrace' to 'lay oneself out to' cf. *I.* 2, 39 προσέπτυκτο and note *ad loc.* For the spatial metaphor see note on *O.* 1, 22 προσέμειξε.

98: μέλιτι. See my note on *O.* 7, 7 νέκταρ. Similarly *I.* 5, 54 μέλιτι. Cf. also the frequent use of compounds with μελί- (Kaimio, 158): see further note on *N.* 11, 18 μελιγδούποισι.

99: εὐάνορα. Probably in a military sense: see above, on 15 Ἄρης.

99: καταβρέχων. Cf. *P.* 5, 100 ῥανθεισᾶν, *I.* 3-4, 91 ἐπιστάζων, and see my note on *O.* 12, 15 κατεφυλλορόησεν. For honey as a drink cf. Radt. 175-6 n. 3, who compares *N.* 3, 77-9.

99: ἐρατόν. Translations such as 'anmutig' (We.), 'beautiful' (Latt.), 'good-looking' (Nis.) are too weak: just as at 75, *O.* 6, 43, *N.* 6, 12, *I.* 2, 31, fr. 124, 1, Hom. *H.Ap.* 124, the word carries its original force of 'desired', 'desirable'. The reference to Ganymedes (105) suggests that in the present case the term has an erotic connotation[75]: see note on *O.* 1, 41 ἱμέρῳ. Cf. also Vilj., 88, who observes that Pindar does not associate the boy's beauty with his victory as explicitly as at *O.* 8, 19, *O.* 9, 101, *N.* 3, 19[76].

[75] Cf. the parallel drawn between Pelops and Ganymedes at *O.* 1, 40-5. See also Angeli Bernardini (above, n. 4), 25-6, who compares Ibyc. 289 P. Bo.'s 'loved' and Farn.'s 'sweet' are too vague.

[76] This difference is ignored by Bowra, 167-8. Hubbard's suggestion (69) that the boy's beauty will become "the idealized object of an immortal *erōs*" and that "this *erōs* ... is also the immortal pleasure of the text which will be enjoyed by countless generations of men" is a mere figment of his own imagination.

100: εἶδον. Le. quite arbitrarily speaks of "il definitivo affermarsi di Verità e la conclusiva e ciclica rimozione del 'debito', trasformato in debito di amorosa ammirazione".

101: βωμόν. See note on *O.* 1, 93 βωμῷ.

101: Ὀλύμπιον. 'At Olympia': cf. *N.* 1, 17 Ὀλυμπιάδων φύλλοις ἐλαῖαν, and the use of adjectives equivalent to the genitive of a substantive (15 Κύκνεια, etc.). Similarly *I.* 2, 27.

102: κεῖνον. Vilj. (87-8) rightly argues that this does not belong to ἰδέᾳ ... κεκραμένον (e.g. Wil., 220, Wüst, 266), but his objection that the common interpretation, 'at the time of the games', would tactlessly recall the delay is as futile as his remark that κατά is not appropriate to denote a point of time: Pindar simply says that he was present during the contest[77]. Vilj. wrongly adopts Fränkel's view (*W.u.F.*, 20)[78] that χρόνον refers to the boy's age and that κεῖνον points forward to 104 ἅ: Fränkel masks the difficulty of the intermediate words by adding 'such' to ἰδέᾳ and ὥρᾳ.

103: ἰδέᾳ. Dative of limitation: see above, on 66 πάλᾳ. Nassen (238) wrongly thinks that the word primarily refers to the fact that "Hagesidamos had trained his body for the endurance which he would need in the rigorous contest and had developed it to its fullest strength and vigor". For καλός referring to physical beauty cf. Hubbard, 142 n. 34.

104: κεκραμένον. Similarly *P.* 5, 2, *P.* 10, 41. See further note on *O.* 1, 22 προσέμειξε[79].

105: ἀναιδέα. Does not imply criticism, for the meaning is 'not shrinking from anything': cf. Hom. Δ 521 λᾶας ἀναιδής, E 593 Κυδοιμὸν ἀναιδέα, E. *H.F.* 165-6, where ἀναίδεια is contrasted with εὐλάβεια, and the λίθος ἀναιδείας in the Areopagus (LSJ II). In such contexts αἰδώς has its original meaning of 'keeping oneself at a respectful distance': see my remarks in Mnem. III 12 (1944), 47-60, IV 10 (1957), 250, and Lampas 5 (1972), 114. Cf. also my notes on *O.* 3, 42 αἰδοιέστατος, *O.* 7, 44 Αἰδώς, *N.* 11, 45 ἀναιδεῖ, and Hes. *Op.* 192[80].

---

[77] Hubbard (69) wrongly maintains that here "time is reduced to a point". Wil. (220) is equally wrong in concluding that "diese Blüte besteht nicht mehr".

[78] Similarly A. M. Komornicka, Eos 64 (1976), 14, Erbse, 100 n. 14, Le.

[79] Nassen (238) wrongly thinks that κεκραμένον is a "very vivid metaphor"; she further seems to be unaware of the fact that "the mixing of wine" does *not* take place at the time "when the fruit is just ripe for picking".

[80] F. J. Nisetich, TAPA 107 (1977), 246-7, explains ἀναιδής at *O.* 10, 105 by: "What is shameless about death is that it makes no distinctions; it overtakes mortals without exception, when it pleases, with no regard to their wishes". This explanation shows that 'shameless' is not a happy translation.

105: θάνατον. I doubt whether Nassen (239) is right in suggesting the implication that Agesidamus, too, will become immortal: Ganymedes owed his immortality to his physical beauty, whereas Agesidamus will owe it, as has already been said (86-96), to the victory ode.

105: ἄλαλκε. The emendation ἄλκε or ἄλξε, though adopted by many editors, is unparalleled. P. Maas (*Kleine Schriften*, 19) proposes to read ἄλξατε at A. *Sept.* 178, but Wilamowitz (followed by Mazon, Groeneboom, Untersteiner) is probably right in accepting the correspondence of cretic and iambus[81] Similarly, he doubts (220 n. 2) the necessity of altering *O.* 10, 105. For a metrical license between two proper names see my note on *O.* 14, 21 ἔλθε. Gild., Pu., Tur. print Mommsen's μόρον for θάνατον, but μόρος used in the sense of 'death' is so common that θάνατον is unlikely to be a gloss.

105: σύν. See above, on 21 σύν.

---

[81] Hutchinson prefers Blomfield's emendation of γε at 170, but this looks like a stop-gap.

OLYMPIAN 11

Date

Vilj. (6 ff.) rightly defends the common assumption that this ode has been composed directly after the victory (476), that it was performed by Pindar himself[1] at a symposium held in Olympia[2], and that it was intended to express the poet's gratitude for the commission of a longer poem (*O.* 10) to be performed after the victor's return home[3].

Metre

The dactyloepitrites do not show abnormal features. The combination of epitrite and choriambus at 3 and 9 is interesting with regard to the problem of irregular responsion: see my note on *O.* 3, 35 βαθυζώνου.

Composition

Gild. writes: "The strophe sets forth the importance of the song, the antistrophe the divine calling of the poet, the epode the noble stock of the victor". Such a division is too rigid (cf. 11-14), and the term 'stock' is misleading. The poet rather connects some standard elements of the victory ode in an associative way.

It is true that Bundy's considerations "sind vom methodischen Ansatz her so verfehlt und lassen im einzelnen so sehr ein gesundes Urteil vermissen, dass sie die nähere Auseinandersetzung nicht verlohnen" (Wüst, 249 n. 1): cf. my review in Mnem. IV 18 (1965), 297-8. However, as he has become a kind of saint in the field of Pindaric criticism, I shall pay some attention to his essay in my commentary.

Commentary

1-6. For the priamel see my note on *O.* 3, 42.

1: ἔστιν. For the position of the word see note on *O.* 1, 35 ἔστι.

---

[1] Solo performance is alluded to at *O.* 1, 16-7, *N.* 1, 19-23, *N.* 4, 13-6. See also Bowra, 161.

[2] Schwenn (235) argues that the "breite Ausführung des Heimatlobes" favours the assumption that the poem "in der Öffentlichkeit von Lokroi vorgetragen werden soll" (similarly Fränkel, 498), but this is no cogent argument. T. B. L. Webster, *The Greek Chorus* (London 1970), 107, takes 16 ἔνθα to refer to Olympia, which is obviously impossible.

[3] For the meaning of 14 κελαδήσω see note *ad loc.* For the question who commissioned the ode cf. Vilj., 7 n. 29.

1: **πλεῖστα.** Probably to be taken as predicate (Dorns., We., *et al.*). For the use of superlatives in priamels see note on *O.* 1, 1 ἄριστον.

2: **χρῆσις.** Not 'use' (Fränkel, 496; similarly Le. 'la casa più utile'), but 'need': conversely, χρεία usually means 'need', but sometimes 'use'. The implication of the priamel is that the victory ode belongs to the necessaries of life, just as the natural elements. See further Vilj., 16, who seems to me wrong, however, in adopting Fränkel's suggestion (497 n. 3) that wind and rain in addition to the obvious reference to navigation and agriculture[4] also allude to their function as symbols of the victory ode[5]. See also Bundy I, 10, who is wrong, however, in taking *I.* 1, 47 μισθός to parallel χρῆσις: the latter term does not express the same "natural yearning" as the former.

3: **ὀμβρίων.** Fenn. puts a comma after ὀμβρίων, not after ὑδάτων, but for the construction (a quasi-enallage) see my note on *O.* 3, 13-5.

3: **παίδων.** For genealogical imagery in Pindar cf. Dorns., *P.S.*, 51, Schmid, 578 n. 17, Bowra, 198-9[6].

4: **πόνῳ.** See note on *O.* 10, 22 δέ.

4: **πράσσοι.** For εἰ with optative, properly 'suppose that ...', but virtually equivalent to εἰ with indicative cf. *P.* 1, 81, *P.* 8, 14, *I.* 2, 34. Christ's emendation πράσσει (Gild.) is unnecessary. For the meaning 'accomplish' see my note on *O.* 12, 8 πράξιος.

4: **μελιγάρυες.** In Homer (μ 187) used of the Sirens. For Pindar's use of compounds with μελι- see note on *N.* 11, 18 μελιγδούποισι. See further note on *O.* 1, 3 γαρύεν.

5: **ὑστέρων.** For the idea that the victory ode perpetuates the victor's fame see my note on *O.* 7, 11 ζωθάλμιος. Cf. also Vilj., 16-7 and n. 8.

5: **ἀρχά.** Barkhuizen (58-9) suggests that this alludes to the name Ἀρχέστρατος (11), but this seems to me a far-fetched assumption.

5: **λόγων.** Similarly *P.* 6, 16-8 λόγοισι θνατῶν εὔδοξον ἅρματι νίκαν ... ἀπαγγελεῖ. Cf. also *N.* 6, 30 ἀοιδαὶ καὶ λόγοι and *N.* 11, 17 ἐν λόγοις δ' ἀστῶν ἀγαθοῖσιν ἐπαινεῖσθαι χρεών[7].

6: **τέλλεται.** The number of the verb is assimilated to the predicate: cf. K.G. I, 75, Schw. II, 608. The construction should not be called

---

[4] Gild. goes too far in writing that "in Greece navigation and agriculture go hand in hand", but it is true that the two are associated by Hesiod (*Op.* 618 ff.). See further Bundy I, 11 n. 34, who goes too far, however, in calling *O.* 14, 7 "occupational".

[5] Wüst (252) seems to me wrong in writing: "es scheint fast, als wollte der Dichter ... dem Adressaten die Verwunderung benehmen über das ihm spontan gewidmete Lied".

[6] Cf. also I. Waern, *Γῆς ὀστέα: The Kenning in Pre-Christian Greek Poetry* (Uppsala 1951), 124.

[7] For the meaning of λόγιοι at *P.* 1, 94 and *N.* 6, 45 cf. G. Pfligersdorffer, WS 61-62 (1943-47), 9 ff. Gal. is certainly wrong in taking the ὕστεροι λόγοι to refer to *O.* 10.

σχῆμα Πινδαρικόν (K.G. I, 68, Schw., *loc. cit.*), for in that case the verb precedes the subject (cf. e.g. *P.* 10, 71, fr. 78, 2)[8]. The meaning is not equivalent to τελεῖται (Wil., 217 n. 1; similarly Dorns., Latt., Fränkel, 496), but 'rises', viz. as a plant: cf. *O.* 6, 105 ἐμῶν δ' ὕμνων ἄεξ' εὐτερπὲς ἄνθος, *O.* 9, 48 ἄνθεα δ' ὕμνων, *I.* 3-4, 45 φύλλ' ἀοιδᾶν. The victor's fame, too, is imagined as a plant (see my note on *O.* 12, 15 κατεφυλλορόησεν), and this idea may have favoured the construction[9].

6: ὅρκιον. Vilj. (17 n. 9) adopts Fenn.'s interpretation, 'record of a statement made on oath' (similarly Pu. 'attestation', Dorns., *et al.*), but this does not go very well with the dative ἀρεταῖς. I therefore prefer the translation 'pledge' suggested by the scholia. Gild.'s explanation, "they are called a pledge because they bind themselves to prove what has been done", cannot be correct, for only the man who gives the pledge may be said to bind himself. The victor's ἀρεταί will have the ode as a pledge that they will be remembered by posterity (Farn.).

6: ἀρεταῖς. 'Outstanding achievements': see my notes on *O.* 3, 18 ἀρετᾶν and *O.* 10, 20 ἀρετᾷ.

7-9. Wrongly called by Bundy (I, 12) "a second priamel". It is even misleading to call the lines a "foil" (*ibid.*), for according to the *Oxford Concise Dictionary of Current English* a foil is "anything that sets something off by contrast", and there is hardly a contrast between the Olympic victors in general and Hagesidamus. Bundy (19) construes such a contrast in his paraphrase of 8-9, "the laudator expresses solicitous concern for each item in the ledger of Hagesidamos' glory only to dismiss the full tale in favor of a brief but spirited vaunt", but he can do so only by pressing the image implied in ποιμαίνειν: "The shepherd is concerned for *all* his sheep and will *count* them into the fold" (my italics).

7: ἀφθόνητος. 'Without envy', not on the part of the public (Gild., Fenn., Pu., Vilj., 17), for if such envy was always absent Pindar would not defend himself against it (see note on *O.* 10, 9 ἐπιμομφάν), but on the part of the poet, hence equivalent to 'abundant': cf. *N.* 3, 9 τᾶς ἀφθονίαν ὄπαζε μήτιος ἁμᾶς ἄπο, *I.* 5, 24 μὴ φθόνει, and see my note on *O.* 7, 1 ἀφνειᾶς[10]. The word should be translated as an adverb, for it is construed as a predicate.

---

[8] Accordingly, Tur. is wrong in thinking that the reading ἀρχαί "servari potest, si schema Pindaricum pones".

[9] Vilj. (15 n. 2) wrongly follows van Groningen in taking ἀρχά to be one of the subjects of the sentence.

[10] Similarly *P.* 6, 7 ἑτοῖμος ὕμνων θησαυρός, which does not mean that the song "stets wieder gesungen werden kann" (Wüst, 41), but that it is 'ready to be used' like a copious dish: cf. Hom. ξ 453, E. *Cycl.* 357, Theocr. 13, 63. Bundy (I, 13-5) seems to me wrong in comparing *N.* 10, 1 ff. and *I.* 3-4, 19-37, where the primary abundance lies in the victor's achievements. G. M. Kirkwood, in D. E. Gerber (ed.), *Greek Poetry and Philosophy:*

8: οὗτος. Vilj. (17) rightly argues that this does not refer to ὑστέρων λόγων (Fenn.), but to μελιγάρυες ὕμνοι.

8: ἄγκειται. Not 'laid up' (Fenn., Bo., Latt.), 'laid in store' (Nis.), 'aufgehoben' (Fränkel, 497), 'est le privilège' (Pu.), but 'is dedicated' (as a votive offering): cf. Vilj., 17 n. 11, who compares *O*. 5, 8, *O*. 13, 35, *N*. 4, 81. The perfect has intensifying force: see note on *O*. 1, 94 δέδορκε.

8: τά. Not the song (Gild., Dorns., Vilj., 18, *et al.*), which does not go very well with ποιμαίνειν, but famous victories, implied in Ὀλυμπιονίκαις.

8: μέν. It is not correct to say that "μέν and δέ attack different members of the antithesis with chiastic effect" (Gild.), for each particle refers to the whole clause: see my note on *O*. 7, 64 μέν.

9: ποιμαίνειν. 'Watch over', 'guard'. Vilj. (18 n. 13) rightly argues that we should not compare *O*. 10, 95 τρέφοντι, as is done by Dorns. (*P.S.*, 61) and Gund. (126 n. 211), but rather *O*. 10, 88, *N*. 8, 6, and *I*. 5, 12. For the poet's defensive attitude see note on *O*. 1, 112 ἀλκᾷ.

9: ἐθέλει. Commonly translated as 'is willing', but this is more appropriate in a special case (such as *P*. 9, 1, *P*. 10, 5) than in a general statement. For the use of ἐθέλω in the sense of 'to be wont' cf. *P*. 1, 62, *N*. 7, 10, LSJ II 2, and my note on Pl. *Meno* 95 b 1, Mnem. IV 10 (1957), 297. It may be added that this use of ἐθέλω is based on its basic meaning 'to be disposed to': cf. A. Dihle, *Die Vorstellung vom Willen in der Antike* (Göttingen 1985), 31-2 (whose view that βούλομαι primarily refers to "das verstandesmässige Planen" does not seem to me correct: βούλομαι originally means 'to prefer'). See also note on *N*. 11, 40 οὐκ ἐθέλει.

10: ἐκ θεοῦ. Schwenn (236 n. 5) compares Hes. *Th*. 94-5 ἐκ γάρ τοι Μουσέων καὶ ἑκηβόλου Ἀπόλλωνος / ἄνδρες ἀοιδοὶ ἔασιν. Cf. also Hom. ρ 518-9 ἀοιδὸν ... ὅς τε θεῶν ἐξ / ἀείδῃ. For ἐκ 'through the agency of' cf. LSJ A III 5. See further note on *O*. 10, 21 θεοῦ σὺν παλάμαις.

Bundy (I, 11) completely misses the point by maintaining that in v. 10 Pindar informs the audience "that his praise will be brief, but heartfelt and to the point", and in calling ἀφθόνητος and ἐκ θεοῦ "contrasting elements": the real contrast is between ἁμετέρα and θεοῦ. There is of course some contrast between human skill and divine inspiration (Bundy, 15-7), but in the present context the need of divine help is emphasized.

10: σοφαῖς. Not 'wise' (Bo., Latt., We., Nis.), but 'skilful': see my note on *O*. 7, 53 σοφία.

Studies ... L. Woodbury (Chico 1984), 178, thinks that ἀφθόνητος means 'abundant' and "also implies lack of envy" (on the part of the public), but such an ambiguity seems to me impossible.

10: ἀνθεῖ. Not 'is popular' (LSJ II 3 b), but 'abounds in': cf. Hdt. IV 1, 1 ἀνθούσης τῆς 'Ασίης ἀνδράσι, LSJ II 3 a. For the vegetative metaphor cf. Bowra, 248-9.

10: πραπίδεσσιν. Equivalent to φρένες: cf. Onians, 38 n. 6, and see my remarks in Lampas 5 (1972), 102. The dative is not instrumental (Fenn. *et al.*), but a dative of limitation: see note on *O.* 1, 87 πτεροῖσιν.

10: ὁμῶς ὤν. Most editors read ὁμοίως (cf. Vilj., 18-9 n. 15), but an ellipse of ὥσπερ καὶ σὺ νενίκηκας (schol.; cf. Dorns. 'in ebenbürtiger Weise') or of 'as in other things' (Nis.) seems to me impossible[11]. Bundy's interpretation (I, 17-9) of ὁμοίως as a litotes for 'better' is based on a misunderstanding of ἐκ θεοῦ (see above) and of *P.* 9, 78-9, where ὁμοίως certainly belongs to παντός: cf. Verdenius-Waszink on Arist. *GC* 324 a 15. Pu. takes the transmitted reading ὅμως ὤν to introduce the next sentence, but his explanation, "Cependant, qu'il doive être inspiré ou non aujourd'hui, il chantera", is absurd. Mommsen's ὁμῶς ὤν is better: in that case the meaning is 'in the same way as I use (9 ἐθέλει) to celebrate victors'[12]: cf. *O.* 8, 56-7 καὶ Νεμέᾳ γὰρ ὁμῶς / ἐρέω ταύταν χάριν.

11: ἴσθι. Similarly *O.* 6, 8, *N.* 5, 48. The asyndeton marks the conclusion: see my note on *O.* 3, 45 οὐ.

11: νῦν. 'In the present case': see my note on *O.* 3, 34. Wüst (250) suggests to read νυν (cf. *O.* 10, 78), but this is not supported by the metre: cf. Erbse, 92 n. 2. It is misleading to say that νῦν and the address to Hagesidamus have climactic force, as is assumed by Bundy (I, 5-6): Pindar bestows more care on the gnomic utterance, and the present sentence is a simple application. See also note on *O.* 1, 10-1.

13: κόσμον. 'A well-ordered composition': fr. 194, 2-3 εἶα τειχίζωμεν ἤδη ποικίλον / κόσμον αὐδάεντα λόγων, and see further J. Kerschensteiner, *Kosmos* (Munich 1962), 9-10, who compares the phrase κόσμος ἐπέων (e.g. Sol. 2 D. = 1 W., 2, Parm. B 8, 52, Democr. B 21)[13].

Kerschensteiner (10) concludes from ποικίλον that κόσμος at the same time means 'eine kunstvolle Ausschmückung des Liedes', but τειχίζωμεν shows that the structure of the composition is meant. Accordingly, the translation 'adornment' (Fenn., Dorns., We., Fränkel, 497, Wüst, 249) is not correct.

The accusative is to be explained as an apposition to the unexpressed internal object of κελαδήσω: see note on *O.* 10, 78 χάριν.

---

[11] Schwenn (235-6) explains ὁμοίως taken in this sense as an expression of self-confidence, but this does not suit the context. We.'s 'beständig' (i.e. just as formerly) is not appropriate either. The Byzantine reading ἰσαεί (Fenn.) is certainly wrong: cf. Vilj., 18 n. 15.

[12] Not 'wie überhaupt die Dichter den Sieger preisen' (Böhmer quoted by Vilj., 18 n. 15).

[13] Cf. also my remarks in Mnem. IV 36 (1983), 16-8.

13: ἐπί. Commonly taken to mean 'in addition to' or even 'put on top of' (Gild., Fenn., Wil., 217 n. 4, Le.), but Me. seems to me right in adopting the scholiast's explanation διὰ τοῦ στεφάνου: cf. *P.* 10, 58 ἕκατι στεφάνων, and for ἐπί 'on account of' see note on *O.* 1, 113. Cf. also *P.* 1, 36 ταύταις ἐπὶ συντυχίαις, *I.* 1, 47 μισθὸς γὰρ ἄλλοις ἄλλος ἐφ' ἔργμασιν.

13: χρυσέας. 'Splendid'. Similarly *O.* 8, 1, *P.* 10, 40, *N.* 1, 17, Alcm. 3, 3, 68, Sa. 132, 2. Wüst (13) writes: "χρύσεος [at *P.* 10, 40] scheint nicht wörtlich gemeint sondern Wertbegriff zu sein ... entsprechend der Wertschätzung des Goldes bei Pindar". This is misleading, for the visual aspect (radiance of universal light) is not absent: see note on *O.* 1, 1 χρυσός. Duchemin (56 and 226) may be right in suggesting that the word has the overtone of 'immortalizing': see my notes on *O.* 3, 19 χρυσάρματος and 42 αἰδοιέστατος, and *I.* 2, 26 χρυσέας (Νίκας).

14: ἀδυμελῆ. For the emphasis put on sweetness see my notes on *O.* 3, 8 γλυκύν and 11 ἀδυμελεῖ. Cf. also 4 μελιγάρυες.

14: κελαδήσω. 'Sing loudly': cf. Ge. on *O.* 1, 9 κελαδεῖν. Similarly *P.* 3, 113 ἐπέων κελαδεννῶν, *P.* 9, 89 Χαρίτων κελαδεννῶν. See further note on *O.* 1, 3 γαρύεν.

The future refers to *O.* 10. Me., Pu., Bundy I, 21-2, Wüst, 251, Erbse, 98 ff., Hubbard, 61 take it to refer to the present ode. It is true that the future can have desiderative force (see note on *O.* 1, 36 φθέγξομαι), but Vilj. (9-10) rightly observes that 11 ἴσθι νῦν and 16 ἐγγυάσομαι are too pompous to refer to such a short and simple poem[14].

15: Ζεφυρίων. See note on *O.* 10, 13 Ζεφυρίων. For the conventional shift of attention from the victor to his native town cf. Bundy I, 20-1.

15: γενεάν. 'Race', hence 'nation': cf. LSJ I 1.

15: ἀλέγων. Properly 'taking care of' (cf. *I.* 8, 46, Hom. ζ 268), hence 'seeing to it that they get their due praise', just as the poet is 'helping' the victor and 'guarding' his fame: see notes on *O.* 1, 110 ἐπίκουρον and *O.* 11, 9 ποιμαίνειν. Cf. also Vilj., 20 n. 18[15].

16: ἔνθα. 'There' (see above, p. 87 n. 2) or (perhaps more probably: cf. 19 ἀφίξεσθαι) 'thither' (Me., Fränkel, 497, Bundy I, 23-4, Nis.): it seems bizarre to suggest that the κῶμος goes all the way from Olympia to Locri, but cf. *N.* 9, 1-2 κωμάσομεν παρ' Ἀπόλλωνος Σικυωνόθε, Μοῖσαι, / τὸν νεοκτίσταν ἐς Αἴτναν. Similarly the victory ode is said to 'come from' Olympia: *O.* 1, 8, *O.* 3, 9-10[16].

---

[14] Wüst (253) is certainly wrong in thinking that the performance of *O.* 11 will be repeated in Locri.

[15] 'Shining with love for' (Nis.) is too strong.

[16] The translation 'Go there and join the revels' (Bundy, Nis.) seems to me to imply an impossible ellipse.

16: συγκωμάξατε. Scil. together with the victor's friends who will form the chorus for *O.* 10. For the linking of the victory song to the κῶμος cf. Bundy I, 22-3, and see my note on *O.* 3, 6 ἀγλαόκωμον.

16: ἐγγυάσομαι. The asyndeton has explanatory (motivating) force: see my note on *O.* 3, 26 ἔνθα. For the desiderative force of the future see note on *O.* 1, 36 φθέγξομαι.

Bundy (I, 24) writes that ἐγγυάσομαι "rhetorically heightens the laudator's praise by setting itself firmly and confidently against imaginary objections", but the term 'rhetorically' is misleading because Pindar is always on his guard against public criticism: see note on *O.* 10, 9 ἐπιμομφάν.

17: ὔμμιν. Vilj. (20 n. 19) rightly argues that the transmitted reading μή μιν (Fenn.) is impossible.

17: ὦ Μοῖσαι. The late position has emphatic force: cf. Vilj., 22, and see also my notes on *O.* 12, 6a ἐλπίδες and *O.* 14, 22 νέαν. For ὦ implying close acquaintance see my note on *O.* 14, 13.

17: φυγόξεινον. For the omission of the first negation cf. E. *Hec.* 373 λέγουσα μηδὲ δρῶσα, K.G. II, 291, Denn., 194. Vilj. (23) thinks that the phrase expresses the poet's hope of a favourable reception of his work[17], but he rightly adds (n. 31) that hospitality is a *topos* in the praise of cities and their rulers: see also my note on *O.* 3, 1 φιλοξείνοις[18].

For the use of φεύγω as a virtual negative cf. Race, 111.

17: στρατόν. 'Body of men', hence 'people': cf. LSJ 3. Barkhuizen (59) implausibly suggests that the word reminds us of 11 Ἀρχεστράτου.

18: μηδέ. Bergk's emendation μήτε (adopted by Wil., 217 n. 5, Tur., Sn.M., *et al.*) is unnecessary: cf. E. *Hec.* 373 quoted above, K.G. II, 291, Denn., 194. The use of μή instead of οὐ indicates a subjective conviction: cf. K.G. II, 193 ff.

18: μηδ' ἀπείρατον. For the litotes cf. K.G. II, 180, Schw. II, 184, A. Köhnken, Glotta 54 (1976), 62-7, Race, 105.

18: καλῶν. Vilj. (24) thinks that this implies a compliment paid to the Locrians for the commission of the ode, but he rightly adds that interest in poetry and music is a *topos* in the praise of cities or rulers: see notes on *O.* 1, 15 μουσικᾶς and *O.* 10, 14 Καλλιόπα. Accordingly, it is unnecessary to assume that Pindar thinks of special artists (Vilj., 25, Wüst, 253-4).

19: ἀκρόσοφον. For ἀκρο- 'extremely' cf. LSJ ἄκρος III. For σοφός 'skilful' see above, on 10 σοφαῖς. The word probably refers to their ability

---

[17] Similarly, Bundy (I, 26) suggests that the word points to the hospitality which the Muses will enjoy in Locri.

[18] I do not believe that the word, just as ἀκρόσοφον and αἰχματάν, has "universalizing force" (Bundy I, 24).

of producing, as well as of judging, art: cf. *P.* 4, 295, *P.* 6, 49, *I.* 2, 12, and see my remarks in Mnem. IV 36 (1983), 23[19].

19: αἰχματάν. Another *topos*: see notes on *O.* 1, 23 ἱπποχάρμαν and *O.* 10, 15 Ἄρης. Vilj. (26) wrongly follows Gild. and Fenn. in thinking that Pindar alludes to their victory over Croton (550-40!).

19: ἀφίξεσθαι. Bundy (I, 27) takes the future to refer to the present poem (see above, on 14 κελαδήσω) and argues that "the arrival motive refers always to the arrival of the *current* song", but this is a weak argument because Pindar seldom announces future songs. For the imagery of arrival see above, on 16 ἔνθα.

19: τε. Schr. (followed by Bundy I, 26 n. 63) is probably right in taking τε to join ἀκρόσοφον to the preceding line: in that case τε has specifying force: see note on *O.* 10, 11 ὀπᾷ τε.

19: τό. For the separation of article and substantive cf. *O.* 13, 83, *P.* 8, 22-4, *P.* 12, 20-1, and see my notes on *O.* 12, 6a ἐλπίδες and *O.* 14, 22 νέαν. The article probably has possessive force: cf. K.G. I, 593.

19: γάρ. Motivates 16 ἐγγυάσομαι: the qualities just mentioned form their fixed character (Vilj., 27-8). For the fact that the meaning of the simile is not made explicit see note on *O.* 10, 9 ψᾶφον.

19: ἐμφυές. For the importance attached by Pindar to human φυά see note on *O.* 10, 20 φύντο.

19: αἴθων. Cf. Hector's horse Αἴθων 'Sorrel' (Hom. Θ 185). See further Vilj., 29 n. 59.

19: ἀλώπηξ. Its proverbial slyness has nothing to do with the character of the Locrians (as is assumed by Wil., 217-8, Fränkel, 498, Dorns., *P.S.*, 97, who wrongly associates it with ἀκρόσοφον), but contrasts with the impetuosity of the lion: cf. Bundy I, 29 ff., who compares *I.* 3-4, 63-5 and fr. 237, and rightly remarks that "it is only against bitter foes that the deviousness of the fox is an acceptable recourse". He is certainly wrong, however, in concluding that the fox represents "mere technicians ... with whom the straightforward lion confidently vies in praise of a given laudandus, having recourse to the 'plain blunt' force of natural enthusiasm" (similarly, Hubbard, 111, subsumes lion-fox under the contrast φυά-τέχνα): he compares *O.* 9, 81 τόλμα and 109 θαρσέων, and *O.* 13, 11 τόλμα, but in the present passage γάρ (taken by Bundy to motivate 16 ἐγγυάσομαι!) clearly shows that the gnome refers to the innate nature of the Locrians, not of the poet. See further R. Stoneman, CQ 26 (1976), 190-1, and Vilj., 28 ff., who rightly points out that such a

---

[19] Bundy (I, 26) seems to me wrong in thinking that the word also refers to "general deliberative ability". He compares fr. 199, but there the βουλαὶ γερόντων are clearly separated from χοροὶ καὶ Μοῖσα.

polar couple represents a whole (cf. Dorns., *P.S.*, 102)[20]. He also plausibly suggests that Pindar uses some proverb(s): cf. Schmid, 603 n. 5.

20: ἐρίβρομοι. Similarly *I.* 3-4, 64 ἐριβρεμετᾶν. The word has the overtone of 'furious': cf. LSJ βρέμω and βρόμος[21]. For ἐρι- in Pindar cf. Kaimio, 154.

20: λέοντες. Fenn. wrongly thinks that "they represent the noble, such as the Locrians": see above on 19 ἀλώπηξ.

20: διαλλάξαιντο. Gild. unnecessarily reads -ξαντο: for the omission of ἄν see my note on *O.* 3, 45 εἴην. For the idea cf. *N.* 7, 54 φυᾷ δ' ἕκαστος διαφέρομεν, *O.* 9, 104-6, *N.* 1, 25-8, Hom. ξ 228, Sol. 1 D. = 13 W., 43 ff., F. Heinimann, *Nomos und Physis* (Basel 1945), 99-100, Snell, 58 ff. See also note on *O.* 1, 113 ἐπ' ἄλλοισι.

20: ἦθος. 'Habitual disposition' rather than 'character', which suggests an all-embracing whole: see my note on Hes. *Op.* 67 ἦθος.

---

[20] Le. goes too far in writing that the two animals "sono compendiate *aretái* intellettuali e pratiche".

[21] The word certainly does not allude to "the laudator's ringing praise", as is held by Bundy (I, 32): see above, on 19 ἀλώπηξ.

NEMEAN 11

Date

It is by no means certain that *N.* 11 is a work of Pindar's old age, as is commonly assumed. A connection with fr. 123 cannot be established (see note on 11 Ἀρκεσίλαν), and even if Aristagoras was a brother of Theoxenus, no chronological conclusion can be drawn from fr. 123: cf. Farn. II, 325, B. A. van Groningen, *Pindare au banquet* (Leiden 1960), 79, de Vries, 153-4 (= 102-3). Similarities between *N.* 11 and other odes do not prove anything: H. A. Pohlsander, *The Dating of Pindaric Odes by Comparison*, GRBS 4 (1963), 131-40, has pointed out that "Pindaric odes widely separated by time can show considerable similarities of thought or diction. Thus we must reject the comparison of parallels within Pindar not only as a means of dating *N.* 3 and *N.* 11 but as an approach to Pindaric chronology generally" (139). Cf. also Fogelmark, 84-5.

Metre

The metre (dactyloepitrite) does not present special difficulties. It may be noted that at 5 etc. choriambi appear between epitrites, a fact which supports the view of those who accept the correspondence of these metres: see my note on *O.* 3, 35 βαθυζώνου.

Composition

The structure of the poem is simple and clear. Some problems in the train of thought will be discussed in the commentary: see e.g. notes on 9 ἀλλά, 11 ἄνδρα, 17 δέ, 22 ὀκνηρότεραι, 29 αὖχαι, 43 τὸ δέ, 46 ἐλπίδι, 47 δέ, 48 ἐρώτων.

Commentary

1: Παῖ Ῥέας. Cf. Hes. *Th.* 453-4 and West *ad loc.*

1: ἅ τε. For survivals of epic τε cf. Denn., 523-4: not all his examples of the use "in general statements" in Pindar are equally convincing: here (and e.g. at *O.* 2, 35 and *O.* 14, 2) the function is more likely to be emphatic with a slightly causal nuance (Denn., *ibid.*). See also Ruijgh, 981 ff., who thinks that the relative sentence is digressive and denotes a permanent fact.

1: πρυτανεῖα. For Hestia Prytaneia or Prytanitis cf. *KP* II, 1119.31 ff. The Prytaneum contained the hearth of the city. Hubbard. (57-8) points

out that it embodied a polarity, representing "the extension of the *oikeion* to accommodate the *allotrion*" (cf. 8 ξενίου). See further S. G. Miller, *The Prytaneion* (Berkeley-Los Angeles-London 1978).

The ode was intended to be performed at the installation of Aristagoras as *prytanis* (cf. *KP* IV, 1206.44 ff.) at Tenedos. As we do not know the programme of such inaugurations (εἰσιτήρια), the time of the performance cannot be determined. There will probably have been a banquet, but the view expressed by Dionysius of Phaselis and Didymus that the song belonged to the genre of *paroinia* (similarly Bury, 217) seems to be a mere deduction from vv. 6-10: cf. Pu., 141-2. That it was performed in the Prytaneum appears from the beginning of the poem.

1: **λέλογχας.** Properly 'having obtained as your portion', when the parts of the world were distributed among the gods (cf. Hom. O 190, Hes. *Th.* 393-6, Pind. *O.* 7, 55-9, A. *Pr.* 229-31), but the perfect often means 'to have under one's care' and is especially used of tutelary deities, e.g. at *O.* 9, 15, *H.Hom.* 19, 6, Hdt. VII 53, 2, Pl. *Tim.* 23 d 7.

2: **ὑψίστου.** A traditional epithet of Zeus (LSJ 2) based on the Homeric ὕπατος, ἥμενος ὕφι, ὑφιβρεμέτης, ὑφίζυγος, etc. Similarly *O.* 1, 42, *O.* 4, 1, *N.* 1, 60. See further note on *O.* 10, 45 μεγίστῳ.

2: **ὁμοθρόνου.** Although some gods are represented as sitting on the same throne (e.g. Hades and Persephone), the element -θρονος refers to rulership rather than to a concrete seat: cf. A. *Ag.* 43, 109, *Cho.* 975, S. *O.R.* 237, *O.C.* 425. See further note on *I.* 2, 5 εὐθρόνου.

3: **εὖ.** Equivalent to εὐνόως: cf. LSJ I 2.

3: **δέξαι.** H. Meyer, *Hymnische Stilelemente in der frühgriechischen Dichtung* (Würzburg 1933), 64, points out that this forms the connection between the hymnic opening and the theme of the song, just as at *O.* 5, 3 δέκευ, *O.* 13, 29 δέξαι, *P.* 8, 5 δέκευ.

3: **θάλαμον.** Not necessarily a shrine within the Prytaneum: at *O.* 6, 1 θάλαμος is the whole house (cf. LSJ I 3 and the similar use of μέγαρον at *O.* 6, 2, *P.* 3, 134). Miller, *op. cit.* (above, on 1 πρυτανεῖα), 36 writes: "One should expect with some probability a prytaneion to have two main rooms (the dining room and the room of the hearth)". Farn. is more explicit: "we do not hear of separate chapels within the Town-Hall, though there may have been a barrier round the sacred fire; if so, this spot would be in a special sense her 'thalamos' ". I doubt this last conclusion: δέξαι obviously refers not only to the installation, but also to the tenure of office, and this was performed in the whole building (cf. schol. εἰς τὸ πρυτανεῖον).

4: **εὖ.** The anaphora (similarly 6-7 πολλά) is characteristic of the hymnic style: cf. E. Norden, *Agnostos Theos* (Leipzig 1923), 149 ff., H. S.

Versnel, Mnem. IV 27 (1974), 368 ff. Pindar, however, mostly uses it for the sake of emphasis: cf. Bowra, 206-7. See also Fehling, 206-7.

4: σκάπτῳ. Not of Aristagoras (Fränkel, 572), but of Hestia. Farn. suggests that this is an imaginary picture because statues of Hestia were comparatively rare. Cf. Wil., *Gl.* I, 156: "ein Bild der Göttin neben den Herd zu stellen, der sie ist, würde widersinnig sein". But Pausanias (I 18, 3) mentions a statue of Hestia in the Prytaneum at Athens, and if we assume the performance of the song to have taken place in the town-hall, as the invocation of Hestia seems to imply, reference to an invisible sceptre would have been rather confusing.

For πέλας with dative see my note on *O.* 3, 31 πνοιαῖς, and Friis Johansen-Whittle on A. *Suppl.* 208.

5: γεραίροντες. The force of the participle (their rule is accompanied, and even directed, by their worship) is lost in such translations as 'They honour you and keep Tenedos upright' (Bo.). In a Greek sentence the main idea is often expressed by the participle: see my notes on *O.* 3, 4 εὑρόντι, *O.* 10, 57 διελών.

5: ὀρθάν. 'Upright', hence 'safe', 'prosperous': cf. LSJ III 1. Similarly *N.* 1, 15 Σικελίαν πίειραν ὀρθώσειν, *I.* 6, 65 ὀρθώσαντες οἶκον. Lefkowitz's translation (51) 'on a straight path' is less likely. See further my note on *O.* 3, 30 Ὀρθωσίᾳ. Péron (119 n. 1, 283-4) thinks that ὀρθάν refers either to the direction or to the position of a ship, because φυλάττειν is sometimes used of a steersman (116 n. 7). But in connection with a town the verb most probably means 'to guard' (cf. e.g. A. *Sept.* 135-6 πόλιν ... φύλαξον κήδεσαί τε) and in connection with a predicate 'to maintain', 'to preserve' (cf. LSJ B 3). The predicate is used in a resultative sense: see note on *O.* 10, 95 εὐρύ.

6: πολλά. Equivalent to πολλάκις: cf. LSJ III 1 a.

6: ἀγαζόμενοι. An unusual word, perhaps chosen because it sounds more subdued (or austere) than ἀγαλλόμενοι.

6: πρώταν. Not 'the first of the gods' (Bury) or 'the first of goddesses' (Bo.), but 'before the other gods' and to be predicatively connected with ἀγαζόμενοι: cf. schol. ἀπ' αὐτῆς ἤρχοντο, and *H.Hom.*29, 4-6 οὐ γὰρ ἄτερ σοῦ / εἰλαπίναι θνητοῖσιν ἵν' οὐ πρώτῃ πυμάτῃ τε / Ἑστίῃ ἀρχόμενος σπένδει μελιηδέα οἶνον (see also Allen *ad loc.*), S. fr. 726 πρῷρα λοιβῆς Ἑστία (and Pearson *ad loc.*).

7: κνίσᾳ. Lefkowitz (51) suggests that men who worship a deity with burnt offerings are "celebrating death and the gods' gift to them of life", but her references to Vernant (*Mythe et pensée*, 142) and Burkert (*Homo necans*, 158-9) do not prove anything.

7: λύρα. For musicality as a *topos* in the praise of cities and their rulers see notes on *O.* 1, 15 μουσικᾶς and *O.* 10, 14 Καλλιόπα.

7: **σφι.** Usually taken to be a dative of interest, but in the present case this is virtually equivalent to a dative of agency (βρέμεται being equivalent to 'is played'): see my note on *O.* 12, 3 τίν[1].

7: **βρέμεται.** This verb seems to be more appropriate to the sound of a stringed instrument (cf. *N.* 9, 8 βρομίαν φόρμιγγα) and the *aulos* (cf. Cat. 64, 264 *stridebat tibia*) than to songs. De Vries (152 = 101) speaks of a *zeugma*, but the word could apparently refer to resounding voices (cf. 'to peal'). Slater's translation 'murmur' is absurd in the present context and equally incorrect at *P.* 11, 30: cf. D. E. Gerber, GRBS 24 (1983), 21-6, who points out that βρέμω and related words commonly denote a loud, not a subdued, sound. See also S. L. Radt, Lampas 13 (1980), 403-4 n. 19, and H. Maehler, Hermes 113 (1985), 398-9.

8: **ξενίου.** For hospitality as a *topos* in the praise of cities and their rulers see my notes on *O.* 1, 16 φίλαν and *O.* 3, 1 φιλοξείνοις.

8: **Διός.** Themis is a wife of Zeus (fr. 30, 5, Hes. *Th.* 901) and his *paredros* (*O.* 8, 22). In the present passage, just as at E. *Med.* 208 τὰν Ζηνὸς ὁρκίαν Θέμιν, their relationship is not specified, but the genitive certainly has possessive force, and should not be connected with τραπέζαις (as is done by Sand., who refers to Athen. IV 143 f., and Bo.).

8: **Θέμις.** Most editors do not print this word with a capital because ἀσκεῖται cannot mean 'is worshipped', but only 'is cultivated', 'is practised': cf. Hdt. I 96, 2 δικαιοσύνην ἤσκεε, LSJ II 2[2]. In that case the word may be translated by 'order' or 'law'. But at *O.* 8, 21-2 Σώτειρα Διὸς ξενίου / πάρεδρος ἀσκεῖται Θέμις she is both a personal deity (πάρεδρος) and an abstraction. This is considered by Farn. to be "one of the signs of a hurried composition", but he has overlooked the fact that a similar ambiguity is to be found at *P.* 3, 108-9 τὸν δ' ἀμφέποντ' αἰεὶ φρασὶν / δαίμον' ἀσκήσω, *N.* 7, 4 τεὰν ἀδελφεὰν ἐλάχομεν ἀγλαόγυιον Ἥβαν, Hes. *Op.* 222-4 ἡ (Dike) δ' ἕπεται κλαίουσα πόλιν καὶ ἤθεα λαῶν / ... / οἵ τε μιν ἐξελάσωσι καὶ οὐκ ἰθεῖαν ἔνειμαν, *Op.* 763-4, *Th.* 231-2, Hdt. VI 86 γ, 2, Aeschin. *Ctes.* 233. Cf. also Radt, 183. The law of hospitality, just as δικη, is a principle, but this principle is so fundamental that it is considered to be a divine power, and as soon as a divine power becomes operative in a striking way it is imagined as a divine person: cf. Wil., 202: "Was lebt und wirkt, wird als persönlich gefühlt: darum ist es pervers, von Personifikation zu reden". See further Dorns., *P.S.*, 50 ff., Farn. II, 467 ff., Duchemin, 125 ff., and the important observations made by W. Pötscher, *Das Person-Bereichdenken in der frühgriechischen*

[1] A possessive dative seems to me less likely in this connection, and is to be generally suspected: see note on *O.* 1, 23 οἱ.

[2] Slater's translation 'honour' is misleading.

Periode, WS 72 (1959), 5-25. For the alternance of personification and 'reification' cf. also my note on Hes. *Op.* 224 ἔνειμαν.

For the association of hospitality with righteousness (i.e. giving others their due) cf. *O.* 2, 6 ὄπι δίκαιον ξένων ('strict in his consideration of strangers'), *N.* 4, 12 δίκᾳ ξεναρκέϊ, and see note on *O.* 1, 12 θεμιστεῖον.

8: ἀενάοις. Not αἰενάοις (Sn.M. *et al.*), and not 'ever-flowing' (Farn. *et al.*), but 'everlasting': see my note on *O.* 14, 12 ἀέναον.

9: ἐν τραπέζαις. Bury writes: "Mr. Fennell takes ἐν here in the sense of *with*, but I agree with Rumpel that it has the more literal meaning of place. The tables are not only the instrument, they are also the place of the ἄσκησις". But hospitality is not practised *on* the tables, but *at* table. For ἐν denoting an occasion cf. *O.* 2, 43-4 ἐν ἀέθλοις / ἐν μάχαις τε, *O.* 9, 112 ἐν δαιτί, Hom. Δ 259 ἐν δαίθ', λ 603 ἐν θαλίῃς, A. *Suppl.* 174 ἐν λιταῖσιν, Thuc. VII 73, 2 ἐν τῇ ἑορτῇ, LSJ II 1. For τράπεζα 'meal' cf. LSJ I 2 and see note on *O.* 1, 50 τραπέζαισι.

9: ἀλλά. In wishes and prayers ἀλλά usually means either the transition from the present to the (unknown) future, or from introductory arguments to the wish proper (Denn., 15-6). In the present case these conditions do not apply, but 9-10 forms the continuation of the wish expressed at 3-4. For progressive ἀλλά cf. Denn., 21-2.

9: σὺν δόξᾳ. Equivalent to an adverb: cf. *P.* 9, 96 σὺν δίκᾳ, S. *El.* 872 σὺν τάχει, LSJ A 6.

9-10: τέλος ... περᾶσαι. The translation 'reach the end' (de Vries, 151 = 99, Nis.) is misleading because (1) τέλος properly means 'fulfilment', hence 'performance of a task', 'office' (LSJ I 3), and (2) περάω properly means 'to traverse' and so refers to the whole term of office: cf. schol. τὴν πρυτανείαν[3].

10: περᾶσαι. For infinitives in prayers cf. *P.* 1, 68, K.G. II, 22-3. Some editors read περάσαι (optative), but the subject is more likely to be the whole Council: 11 ἄνδρα marks the point where the attention is focused on Aristagoras.

10: σύν. Not to be altered into νιν (Sn.M. *et al.*), for (1) the subject αὐτούς is easily supplied from the preceding lines, and (2) repetition of words is avoided by Pindar only in the case of proper names and important appellatives (Schmid, 610 and n. 5): cf. *P.* 9, 112-4 γάμον ... γάμον, *N.* 3, 28-30 φέρειν ... φέρειν, *N.* 8, 41-2 ἀνδρῶν ... ἀνδρῶν, Schr., 43-4. For the resultative use of σύν cf. LSJ A 6, and see my note on Hes. *Op.* 119.

---

[3] LSJ I 3 seem to me wrong in classing the present passage with S. *O.R.* 1530 τέρμα τοῦ βίου περάσῃ and E. *Andr.* 101-2 τὴν τελευταίαν ... περάσας ἡμέραν.

10: ἀτρώτῳ. 'Without annoy' (Fenn.; similarly Pu. 'dans la paix du coeur') is too weak: τιτρώσκω originally means 'to damage' (LSJ 2, e.g. Hdt. VIII 18 αἱ ἡμίσεαι τῶν νεῶν τετρωμέναι ἦσαν), and here the meaning is 'not injured by misfortunes or sharp criticisms': cf. *I.* 3, 18 αἰὼν δὲ κυλινδομέναις ἁμέραις ἄλλ' ἄλλοτ' ἐξάλλαξεν· ἄτρωτοί γε μὰν παῖδες θεῶν[4]. It is not correct to say that ἀτρώτῳ repeats the idea of σὺν δόξᾳ in a negative form (Me., Fenn., Bury): κραδίᾳ shows that inner hurt rather than outer reputation is meant.

11: ἄνδρα. Equivalent to αὐτόν: cf. *P.* 1, 69, *P.* 2, 29, and my note on Pl. *Prot.* 309 a 3 in *Studia Platonica: Festschrift H. Gundert* (Amsterdam 1974), 41. The word must refer to Aristagoras, as appears from the identity of 12 δέμας and 13 μορφᾷ. The accusative is not an acc. of respect ('as for the man ...'), for we can hardly supply 'as contrasted with the goddess' (as is suggested by Me., who is followed by Bury and Fränkel, 572-3) after 7-10, but we have to assume a σχῆμα καθ' ὅλον καὶ μέρος: see note on *O.* 1, 68 γένειον[5]. For the father as μέρος cf. Wil., 431 n. 1: "der Vatersname ist kurz für die Abstammung gesetzt, die sozusagen ein Teil des Mannes ist". For μακαρίζω with double accusative Ar. *Vesp.* 588 is the only exact parallel (if Reiske's emendation is accepted; Bury wrongly thinks that τουτί is a cognate object equivalent to τοῦτον τὸν μακαρισμόν). But at 30-1 μέμφομαι (which is the reverse of μακαρίζω) has the same construction[6].

Fenn. writes: "I cannot see the point of congratulating the son upon his father, who kept him from winning the Olympian and Pythian games (*v.* 22)" (similarly de Vries, 152 = 101). But praise of the father is a *topos* in the victory ode: cf. e.g. *O.* 7, 17, *O.* 14, 21 and my note *ad loc.*, *P.* 11, 43, *N.* 4, 13, *I.* 1, 34 (see further Thummer I, 49 ff.). Besides, the father's hesitation with regard to his son's athletic chances hardly detracts from his general laudability.

11: μακαρίζω. C. de Heer, *Μάκαρ - εὐδαίμων - ὄλβιος - εὐτυχής* (Amsterdam 1968), 31-2, points out that μάκαρ usually implies the idea of divinity or at least of a status resembling that of the gods, and that such a suggestion is ruled out by vv. 13-6. He therefore concludes that the verb may be connected with μακάριος, a term which is less heavily loaded, as appears from *P.* 5, 46.

---

[4] I doubt whether Bowra (116) is right in concluding that "the true noble", just as Aristagoras, "do not take injuries to heart".

[5] Lefkowitz (52 n. 19) wrongly calls πατέρα, δέμας, and ἀτρεμίαν accusatives of respect.

[6] Lefkowitz (*loc. cit.*) compares A. *Pr.* 340 τὰ μέν σ' ἐπαινῶ, but there τὰ μέν is adverbial ('on the one hand'). S. *Aj.* 1381 πάντ' ἔχω σ' ἐπαινέσαι and Pl. *Symp.* 222 a 7 ἃ ἐγὼ Σωκράτη ἐπαινῶ are no convincing parallels either, for πάντα and ἅ are more obviously accusatives of respect.

11: μέν. Not to be connected with 12 καὶ ... τε (Me.), but with 13 δέ.

11: Ἀρκεσίλαν. Some editors read Ἁγησίλαν (B) or (for metrical reasons) Ἁγεσίλαν, but the fact that Pindar's beloved Theoxenus of Tenedos was a son of Hagesilas (fr. 123, 15) has been used to satisfy sentimental romanticism (a handsome boy, son of a handsome father, and 48 ἐρώτων as a personal confession: cf. Fränkel, 575: "Obwohl allgemein formuliert, klingt die Schlusswendung wie ein Ausbruch persönlichen Gefühls") rather than to build up a solid argument. Tur. rightly observes: "cum in scholiis p. 187, 8 et 187, 9 bis nomen in utroque codice BD casu accusativo ἀρκεσίλαν legatur, dubium non est, quin v. 11 Ἀρκεσίλαν (non Ἁγεσίλαν) sit legendum".

12: θαητόν. Refers to physical beauty: cf. *P.* 4, 80, *P.* 9, 108, *P.* 10, 58, and Hubbard, 22 n. 34. Bury (216) writes: "The island of Tenedos, noted for the beauty of its women (Athen. XIII, 609 e), was perhaps a land of handsome men also" (similarly Me., 481). But cases of individual beauty were thought worth mentioning, and not only by Pindar (e.g. *O.* 8, 19, *O.* 9, 65; see also my notes on *O.* 10, 99 ἐρατόν and *O.* 14, 7 καλός): cf. the epigram from the first half of the 5th cent. quoted by Lefkowitz (52 n. 19): παῖδα ... κάλλιστον μὲν ἰδεῖν, ἀθλεῖν δ' οὐ χείρονα μορφῆς. The Greek admiration for physical beauty is strikingly illustrated by an extreme case mentioned by Herodotus (V 47, 2): a citizen from Croton was worshipped as a hero after his death at Segesta διὰ ἑωυτοῦ κάλλος. See further my note on Tyrt. 6-7 D. = 10 W., 9, Mnem. IV 22 (1969), 342-3 (to the references given there should be added Hom. B 673-5). Physical beauty was considered important for a magistrate: cf. Xen. *Symp.* 8, 40.

12: ἀτρεμίαν. Usually translated as 'fearlessness', but 'calmness', 'composure' is more correct and better suits his function.

12: σύγγονον. For the value attached by Pindar to inherited qualities cf. τὸ συγγενές at *P.* 10, 12 and *N.* 6, 8. See further below, on 33 πάλαι.

13: δέ. Lefkowitz (51) wrongly translates 'If then ...': δέ has adversative (restrictive) force and answers 11 μέν. Hubbard (58) is wrong, however, in writing: "But these virtues (marked by the μέν of v. 11) can be developed and manifested only through the external display of wealth and athletic victory (marked by the δέ of v. 13)": δέ obviously marks θνατά rather than ὄλβον and ἀέθλοισιν.

13: ὄλβον. For the importance of wealth see note on *O.* 1, 2 πλούτου[7].

13: μορφᾷ. Dative of limitation rather than of instrument: see note on *O.* 1, 87 πτεροῖσιν.

13: παραμεύσεται. Doric for παραμείβομαι: cf. *P.* 1, 45, fr. 23. Not a gnomic future (cf. K.G. I, 171-2), but rather a subjunctive of the aorist:

[7] In addition to the references given there cf. P. R. Colace, in *Studi ... A. Ardizzoni*, II (Rome 1978), 737-45.

cf. *O.* 6, 11, *O.* 7, 3, *P.* 4, 266 and 274, K.G. II, 474. The shift to the indicative ἐπέδειξεν cannot be explained by the assumption that the poet lost sight of the relative beginning of his sentence (as at *O.* 7, 6 and *P.* 4, 268), but probably implies that v. 14 indicates a more firmly established fact than v. 13[8].

13: ἄλλων. Not to be altered into ἄλλους or ἄλλον: the genitive is used on the analogy of διαφέρεσθαί τινος. Similarly ὑπερβάλλειν and καίνυσθαι with genitive: cf. K.G. I, 393.

14: βίαν. Used in a favourable sense: 'strength'. The original meaning is 'natural or vital power': cf. LSJ I 1 and F. Stoessl, Die Sprache 6 (1959), 67-74. It should be added, however, that wrestling and pancration (21) implied a good deal of violence: see note on *O.* 10, 27 πέφνε.

15: θνατά. Pindar points out man's mortality at *P.* 3, 59, *I.* 3, 23, *I.* 5, 16, etc., and it cannot be maintained that the emphasis is stronger here than elsewhere. Lefkowitz (52) argues that the tone of the famous beginning of *N.* 6 is more optimistic than that of *N.* 11, 13-6, but the two passages are hardly comparable: (1) *N.* 6, 6-7 does not refer to death, but to the unpredictability of the outcome of any human undertaking (as has been pointed out by Fränkel, *W.u.F.*, 30 n. 2), and (2) the point of *N.* 11, 15-6 is closely connected with 17-8, as appears from 17 δέ (omitted in Lefkowitz's quotation of the Greek text!): see further below, *ad loc.*

15: περιστέλλων. In spite of Emp. B 126 σαρκῶν ἀλλογνῶτι περιστέλλουσα (scil. τὰς ψυχὰς) χιτῶνι, the phrase περιστέλλων μέλη cannot mean 'sterblicher Glieder Umhüllung tragend' (We.; similarly Nis. 'that he wears a mortal set of limbs'). The word probably refers to the robes of office worn at the installation (Me.) and need not imply that "Aristagoras was a 'glass of fashion' as well as a 'mould of form', somewhat of an 'exquisite' perhaps in personal adornment, or studious at least to compose the folds of his tunic and mantle for displaying most becomingly the graces of his limbs" (Bury, 217). The fact that περιστέλλω "can denote desking out a corpse" (Lefkowitz, 52) is irrelevant in this connection, for there is no evidence for the assumption that the word was especially used in this sense[9].

15: μέλη. I do not believe that Pindar alludes to the meaning 'songs', as is suggested by Hubbard (59 n. 138): these, at least the laudatory ones, are the very opposite of θνατά (cf. e.g. *I.* 3-4, 58-9).

16: τελευτάν. Usually explained as quasi-adverbial, but more naturally to be taken as an apposition to γᾶν. Pindar may have had

---

[8] B. Breyer's emendation ἐπιδείξῃ, also considered by Gildersleeve, AJP 3 (1882), 440-1, is unnecessary.

[9] Lefkowitz refers to Hom. ω 293 and S. *Aj.* 821, 1170, *Ant.* 903, but the passages from Sophocles do not, or not exclusively, refer to dressing.

Xenophanes B 27 ἐκ γαίης γὰρ πάντα καὶ εἰς γῆν πάντα τελευτᾷ in mind. For reminiscences of the Presocratics in his poetry cf. Gund., 55-7, Strohm, 20-3; see also my note on *O.* 3, 42 ὕδωρ. The apposition is put at the beginning of the sentence for the sake of emphasis: cf. *I.* 3, 7 εὐκλέων δ' ἔργων ἄποινα χρὴ μὲν ὑμνῆσαι τὸν ἐσλόν. Lefkowitz (52) creates a structural phantom by assuming a connection between 9 τέλος and 16 τελευτάν.

16: ἐπιεσσόμενος. The metaphor is based on Hom. Γ 57 λάϊνον ἕσσο χιτῶνα and is first found in Alcaeus 129, 17. See further Waern (n. 6 on *O.* 11), 19-22.

17: ἐν. For the instrumental use see note on *O.* 1, 15 ἐν.

17: λόγοις. See note on *O.* 1, 5 λόγων. Hubbard (58-9) seems to me wrong in subsuming both λόγοις and ἀοιδαῖς under the notion of τέχνη: what the citizens say has nothing to do with τέχνη. It is equally misleading to subsume 18-21 under φύσις: ὄλβος (20) certainly does not belong to φύσις.

17: δέ. The force of δέ has been either neglected (e.g. by Fränkel, 574, who calls 15-6 "einen harten Umschlag" and simply remarks: "Die neue Triade hebt vom frischen mit Festesklängen an") or taken to be (a) adversative, (b) explanatory (motivating), or (c) consecutive. (a) Me. assumes a contrast between 15 μεμνάσθω and 17 λόγοις, which is inept. Nis. translates 'yet', which he explains (287) by "But death is no reason not to celebrate when the opportunity arises" (similarly de Vries, 155, = 103). This idea seems to me too flat and trivial for Pindar. (b) Thummer (I, 76) translates μεμνάσθω by 'der mag sich getrost vor Augen halten', but the intention of the Greek cannot be to ease our mind. (c) is considered by Thummer (n. 53), but he again overstates his case (the importance of praise in a poem of celebration) by suggesting that the sadness of death is outshone by the joy of future fame. The train of thought seems to me to be as follows: 'Man's physical being is doomed to perish, and therefore his achievements have to be recorded, so that he may still obtain some degree of immortality'. The idea that immortality is to be secured by fame, and most effectively by a laudatory poem, is a *topos* in Pindar: see my note on *O.* 7, 11 ζωθάλμιος. For the consecutive use of δέ see my note on *O.* 7, 31. Bowra (319) points out that in most poems the metrical division "corresponds neither with the grammatical structure of sentences nor with the flow of the sense" (though he is wrong in taking *N.* 11 to be an exception).

17: ἀγαθοῖς. No enallage (Me. and Bury with schol. ὑπὸ τῶν ἀστῶν τῶν ἀγαθῶν), but 'favourable': cf. *O.* 7, 10 φᾶμαι ἀγαθαί, *I.* 1, 46 ἔπος ἀγαθόν, *I.* 3, 3 ἄξιος εὐλογίαις ἀστῶν μεμῖχθαι. Pindar probably suggests that the name Aristagoras may be understood as 'very well spoken about'. This

seems to me more likely than the etymology 'mächtig im Rat' (Pape-Benseler) adopted by Barkhuizen, 86 (who may be right, however, in taking 14 ἀριστεύων to be another allusion to the name).

17: μιν. This or νιν (Pu.) is a plausible emendation of μέν (defended by Bury as emphatic): δαιδαλθέντα (scil. μέλη) suggested by LSJ cannot serve as the object of μελιζέμεν. It is true that the object has sometimes to be supplied from the context (cf. K.G. II, 561-2), but this is easier if a related word (in this case the same word, but as a subject) precedes.

17: ἐπαινεῖσθαι. A certain emendation of αἰνεῖσθαι: at *P.* 5, 107 the MSS. have the same mistake.

17: χρεών. Contains an ambiguity: fame is necessary to obtain immortality (see above, on 15 θνατά), but it is also due to the victor: cf. *O.* 1, 103, *O.* 3, 7, *O.* 8, 74, *P.* 8, 33, *P.* 9, 104, *I.* 1, 43, *I.* 3, 8, Gund., 43.

18: μελιγδούποισι. Created by Pindar, just as μελίφθογγος (*O.* 6, 21, *I.* 2, 7, *I.* 6, 9), μελίκομπος (*I.* 2, 32). For 'sweetness' as a characteristic of his songs see my note on *O.* 7, 8 γλυκύν. For the connection between honey and song see below, on 18 μελιζέμεν.

The original meaning of δοῦπος, 'thud', 'roar', 'clash' is widened into 'booming sound': see above, on 7 βρέμεται.

18: δαιδαλθέντα. 'Glorified': see note on *O.* 1, 105 δαιδαλωσέμεν.

18: μελιζέμεν. Not to be altered into μελίζεν or μέλει ἐν (Bury, Lefkowitz, 52): for the synizesis in ἀοιδαῖς cf. *I.* 3, 17 τετραοριᾶν, Hes. *Th.* 48 λήγουσαί τ' ἀοιδῆς and my note *ad loc.*, Mnem. IV 25 (1972), 244, Schr., 25-6 and 39. See also note on *O.* 10, 70 ὁ 'Αλιροθίου. Sn.M. refer to the fact that at the end of v. 7 ἀοιδά has three syllables, but I do not believe that correspondence of metrical position carries much weight.

There is a pun in the juxtaposition of μελιγδούποισι and μελιζέμεν: for the association of song and honey see notes on *O.* 10, 3 γλυκύ, 98 μέλιτι, *O.* 11, 4 μελιγάρυες, and the fact that the poet compares himself with a bee (*P.* 10, 54)[10].

19: ἐκ περικτιόνων. A brachylogy for 'from places inhabited by π.' or 'from games organized by π.': cf. *N.* 2, 19 ἐξ ἀέθλων νίκας ἐκόμιξαν. Fenn. wrongly connects the phrase with ἐστεφάνωσαν and translates 'on the authority of'.

19: δέ. Has explanatory (motivating) force: cf. Denn., 169.

---

[10] Similarly Pl. *Io* 534 b. See further H. Wagenvoort, *Inspiratie door bijen in de droom*, Meded. Kon. Ned. Akad. v. Wet., afd. Lett. N.R. 29:8 (1966), espec. 59 ff., 70, 83 ff., J. H. Waszink, *Biene und Honig als Symbole des Dichters und der Dichtung in der griechisch-römischen Antike*, Rhein.-Westf. Akad. d. Wiss., Vortr. G 196 (Düsseldorf 1974), S. Scheinberg, *The Bee Maidens of the Homeric Hymn to Hermes*, HSCP 83 (1979), 1-29, espec. 16 ff. on bees, honey, and true speech.

20: πάτραν. 'Clan' or (more probably) 'native land': cf. *O.* 8, 20 ἐξένεπε κρατέων πάλᾳ δολιχήρετμον Αἴγιναν πάτραν, *P.* 1, 32, *P.* 9, 73, *N.* 9, 12, *I.* 3, 12, Thummer, 55 ff.[11].

20: εὐώνυμον. Probably a resultative predicate (see above, on 5 ὀρθάν), for Tenedos could hardly be considered famous in itself like Athens (*N.* 4, 19) and Aegina (*N.* 7, 85). Bury and Barkhuizen (89) take the word to allude to 33 Πεισάνδρου, which name forms a good omen for Aristagoras' function as *prytanis*, but apart from the question whether πάτραν refers to the clan, Pindar now concentrates on Aristagoras' athletic, not his magisterial, qualities.

21: πάλᾳ. 'On the occasion of ...': see note on *O.* 1, 50 τραπέζαισι.

21: μεγαυχεῖ. 'Glorious' (similarly A. *Pers.* 642). At *P.* 8, 15 μεγάλαυχος means 'vainglorious': αὐχέω often means 'to boast', but the original meaning is 'to declare proudly or confidently' (whether or not rightly), so that at S. *O.C.* 713 αὔχημα has a favourable sense.

22: ἐλπίδες. The original meaning of ἐλπίς is 'supposition' (cf. ἔλπομαι at Hom. I 40, Π 281, Σ 194), of which 'expectation' is a specialization: see further my note on *O.* 12, 6a ἐλπίδες.

22: ὀκνηρότεραι. 'Too hesitant': for this use of the comparative cf. K.G. II, 305, Schw. II, 184-5. Lefkowitz (53) observes that "this apology for non-accomplishment of deeds never attempted is unique", but does not explain why Pindar included it. A possible answer has been suggested by Gundert (111 n. 40): "Fragt man, warum Pindar den Fall, der zumindest für die Eltern peinlich war, überhaupt erwähnt und so weit führt, so ist ein Hauptmotiv die Aufgabe des Dichters, verkannte Areta zur Geltung zu bringen". This is a more plausible explanation than that given in *Mnemosynon* (5-6), where he maintains that "fast zwei Drittel des Festlieds gelten dem Versäumnis der Eltern" and suggests that "es ist, als ob er [Pindar] den Anlass, dass er keine grösseren Siege hatte, geradezu gesucht hätte, um den Abgrund aufzureissen zwischen der lichten Welt des Adels und der Gottverlassenheit der Menschen". Bundy (II, 48 ff.) has rightly pointed out that past misfortunes in the family are used as dark foils for present glory.

22: βίαν. See above, on 14 βίαν.

23: πειρᾶσθαι. One might expect the addition of μή, but this may be omitted if the infinitive is felt as an object: cf. E. *Or.* 263 σχήσω σε πηδᾶν, K.G. II, 214-5, Schw. II, 598 (who compares Thuc. VII 33, 3 ἐπέσχον τὸ εὐθέως τοῖς Ἀθηναίοις ἐπιχειρεῖν).

---

[11] See also W. Keuffel, *Der Vaterlandsbegriff in der frühgriechischen Dichtung* (Würzburg 1942), 32 ff.

24: γάρ. Explains ὀκνηρότεραι (Bury) or (rather) the unexpressed idea of 'wrongly' (Fenn. 'for else'): cf. Denn., 62-3, Bruhn, § 114. Another possibility is to take γάρ as emphatic (γε + ἄρα: see note on *I.* 2, 30 καὶ γάρ): as such it often introduces emotional questions (Denn., 82-5), and it also occurs in exclamations, usually preceded by ἦ (Denn. 284): in the present passage ναὶ μά may be considered equivalent to ἦ.

24: Ὅρκον. Conceived as a divine power: cf. Hes. *Th.* 231, *Op.* 219, Hdt. VI 86, 2, and see above, on 8 Θέμις.

24: ἐμὰν δόξαν. Cf. Ar. *Vesp.* 983, *Pax* 232 γνώμην ἐμήν. Fenn. thinks that "these are accusatives of 'extent, range, sphere', like τὸ ἐμὸν μέρος", Bury and K.G. (I, 317) call the accusative 'adverbial', Farn. calls it 'absolute', Schw. (II, 86) suggests that it originated from a 'prosthetic' nominative. These explanations are unsatisfactory. I am inclined to take the phrase as an apposition to the unexpressed internal object of the sentence: cf. *O.* 7, 16 αἰνέσω πυγμᾶς ἄποινα and my note *ad loc.*

24: παρὰ Κασταλίᾳ. The clause 'if he had participated in the contests' has to be supplied from the context: cf. K.G. II, 565, Bruhn, § 199.

25: εὐδένδρῳ. Cf. *O.* 3, 18, 23, 32-4.

25: μόλων. Scil. 'thither': cf. *N.* 5, 45 ἅλικας δ' ἐλθόντας οἴκοι τ' ἐκράτει, S. *Aj.* 854 νῦν μ' ἐπίσκεψαι μόλων, K.G. II, 87.

26: ἄν. For the position of ἄν cf. K.G. I, 245, who observe: "öfter schliesst es sich an dasjenige Satzglied an, auf welchem besonderer Nachdruck ruht". Similarly *O.* 1, 109 γλυκυτέραν κεν[12].

26: δηριώντων. The active form is not to be found elsewhere in the classical period: for some parallels see my notes on *O.* 3, 25 πορεύεν, *O.* 12, 12a πεδάμειψαν. The participle may have concessive force: cf. Schw. II, 389. It is certainly wrong to assume that the vanquished adversaries function "nicht mehr nur als Folie, sondern zugleich als Beispiel für die κενεόφρονες αὖχαι der Sterblichen", as is suggested by H. Schmitz, *Hypsos und Bios* (Bern 1970), 49.

27: ἑορτάν. Apposition to the internal object of κωμάσαις: see above, on 24 ἐμὰν δόξαν.

27: Ἡρακλέος. 'Established by H.': for the *genitivus auctoris* see my note on *O.* 3, 4 ἄωτον. For Heracles as the founder of the Olympic games cf. *O.* 3, 11 ff. For Pindar's special regard for Heracles see my note on *O.* 3, 16 λόγῳ.

27: τέθμιον. 'Established according to fixed rules' (cf. *O.* 6, 69 τεθμὸς ἀέθλων), hence 'solemn'. Translations such as 'nach der Satzung des Herakles' (Me.), 'founded by Herakles' (Bo.; similarly Latt., Nis.) are misleading.

---

[12] See further M. C. Landreth, *The Position of the Particles ἄν and κε(ν) in Pindar*, Eran. 76 (1978), 13-8, summarized by E. Thummer, Anz. Alt.wiss. 35 (1982), 137-8.

28: ἀνδησάμενος κόμαν. 'Having his hair wreathed': similarly *I.* 1, 28 ἀνδησάμενοι, *I.* 2, 16 ἀναδεῖσθαι; see further my note on *O.* 7, 15 στεφανωσάμενον. The force of ἀνα- may be explained from the fact that a wreath or a head-band (Hom. X 469 ἀναδέσμη) makes the hair enclosed by it appear partly to rise above it.

28: ἐν. Bury rightly observes: "The expression loses its strength if we take ἐν as merely instrumental; the victor's locks are conceived as actually *in* the wreath of olive leaves". Cf. Hom. E 386 δῆσαν κρατερῷ ἐνὶ δεσμῷ, and see above, on 17 ἐν.

28: πορφυρέοις. Not 'bound by purple fillets' (Slater, Lefkowitz, 53, following P. Von der Mühll, *Kleine Schriften,* 194-6), but 'glittering', 'brilliant': cf. H. Gipper, Glotta 42 (1964), 39 ff., O. J. Schrier, Mnem. IV 32 (1979), 316 ff. Similarly *P.* 2, 6 τηλαυγέσιν ... στεφάνοις. Duchemin (198 ff.) rightly points out that φοινικοπέζα said of Demeter and Hecate (*O.* 6, 94, *Pae.* 2, 77) does not refer to colour but to brilliance (cf. Homeric ἀργυρόπεζα).

For the Greek tendency to subordinate colour to nuances of gloss or shine cf. Fogelmark, 17 ff. (see also my note on *O.* 14, 10 χρυσότοξον), who is wrong, however, in concluding (23) that πορφύρεος "denotes colour in Pindar but not in Homer". It is true that we find at *O.* 6, 55 ἴων ξανθαῖσι καὶ παμπορφύροις ἀκτῖσι, but the addition of ἀκτῖσι is significant. Fogelmark's interpretation of the present passage as giving "an impression of beautiful colour" (26) is improbable, for the wild olive does not have any quality which suggests purple.

Me. suggests that πορφυρέοις denotes the high value of the wreath. Similarly Bury: "Regal 'purple' might be considered the queen of colours and used as a metaphor for supreme excellence", and Bowra, 245-6, but χρύσεος 'splendid' in the sense of 'extremely valuable' (see note on *O.* 11, 13 χρυσέας) is not a sufficient parallel for such a figurative use.

29: ἀλλά. The function of ἀλλά obviously is to explain why the possibility indicated in the preceding lines was not realized: it is equivalent to ἀλλὰ γάρ marking the non-fulfilment of a condition (Denn., 104). Lefkowitz (53) thinks that "the reference to binding ... leads into a statement of human limitations" (!).

29: κενεόφρονες αὖχαι. Cf. Hom. Θ 230 κενεαυχέες, and see above, on 21 μεγαυχεῖ. Wil. (432) writes: "ihm wird in einem Atem gesagt, dass er ihn [the victory] hätte erreichen können, und angedeutet, es wäre wohl eher Selbstüberhebung gewesen". Similarly Lefkowitz, 53: "the contest is in the athlete's mind ... the opponents are emotions, 'empty-minded boasts' ... and an 'unadventurous heart' ". But the θυμὸς ἄτολμος obviously refers to the parents' hesitations, and the first part of the sentence (τὸν μὲν ...) serves as a foil to the second part (cf. Gund., 24 and

117 n. 95), i.e., it is intended to give the θυμὸς ἄτολμος a more general perspective: see my note on *O.* 3, 45 κάσόφοις.

30: ἐξ ἀγαθῶν ἔβαλον. Cf. S. *Aj.* 808 χάριτος ἐκβεβλημένη, *El.* 648-9 με πλούτου ... ἐκβαλεῖν, Xen. *An.* VII 5, 6 μὴ ἐκ τῆς Σεύθου φιλίας ἐκβληθείη. The translation 'cast down from' (Fenn. *et al.*) is perhaps too strong, for βάλλω can also mean 'to place': cf. LSJ A I 6.

30: καταμεμφθέντα. The parallelism of the two parts of the sentence suggests that the sense is active (like Hdt. I 77, 1 μεμφθείς, etc.). There seems to lie a difficulty in the fact that the θυμός refers to the parents and ἰσχύν to the son, but the parents may have regarded their son's abilities as part of their own: cf. *P.* 8, 44-5 φυᾷ ... ἐκ πατέρων, and see further above, on 11 ἄνδρα, 12 σύγγονον, and below, on 33 πάλαι.

31: οἰκείων. 'Geeignet für ihn' (We.) is too weak, 'ihm gebührend' (Dorns.; similarly Farn., Latt.), 'within his reach' (Fenn.), 'destined for him' (Dissen, Rumpel) seem to be unparalleled. Pindar probably alludes to his doctrine of φυά (see above, on *O.* 10, 20 φύντα): 'lying in the field of his natural capabilities'.

Hubbard (59) writes: "The proper scope of activity seeks to integrate both the *oikeion* (one's nature) and the *allotrion* (one's positive ambitions)". This is a misleading comment: in Pindar's opinion, one's positive ambitions remain within the limits of one's own nature. It is true that the object of one's ambition is not yet one's property, but it is in a direct line with one's φυά, and therefore should not be called ἀλλότριον. Cf. *P.* 2, 72 γένοι', οἷος ἐσσί, and see further below, on 48 ἀπροσίκτων.

31: παρέσφαλεν. 32 ὀπίσσω shows that παρέσφαλεν cannot mean 'lässt vorbeistraucheln' (Fränkel, 573). The local force of παρα- ('to the side') has apparently been widened to the idea of 'missing' and 'failing'. For the genitive cf. LSJ σφάλλω III 2.

32: ἄτολμος. Another *topos*: one should take risks: e.g. *O.* 6, 9-11, *P.* 4, 185-7. See further note on *O.* 1, 81 κίνδυνος.

33: συμβαλεῖν. 'To conjecture' (cf. LSJ III 3), scil. the presence of ... in their son.

33: μάν. Denn. (330, 337) hesitates between an emphatic and a progressive sense, but the meaning is more likely to be adversative (Denn., 334-5, Slater, 311).

33: πάλαι. Not to be connected with ἀπὸ Σπάρτας (Fenn., Farn., Pu.), but with αἷμα: cf. *I.* 2, 1 οἱ πάλαι φῶτες, LSJ I 2. B. A. van Groningen, *In the Grip of the Past* (Leiden 1953), 50, rightly observes: "The quality of the primogenitor determines the quality of the whole lineage and every member of it shines with the reflected light of his ancestral glory". Cf. also 12 σύγγονον, 30 καταμεμφθέντα, 37-8, and see further Gund., 15 ff., Thummer I, 49 ff., Bowra, 101-2, 171-2.

34: Ἀμύκλαθεν. Cf. G. Huxley, *Pindar's Vision of the Past* (Belfast 1975), 34: "Because in Pindar's opinion Amyklai had been the place where king Agamemnon was murdered on his return home from Troy (*P.* 11,31-32) ... Not until Orestes had killed his mother did he set the Aeolians on their way towards Tenedos". I doubt whether Pindar alludes to the capture of Amyclae mentioned at *P.* 1, 65, as is suggested by Lefkowitz, 54.

35: ἀνάγων. 'Leading over sea': cf. Hom. I 338 λαὸν ἀνήγαγεν ἐνθάδε, LSJ I 2. Orestes as a leader of Aeolian colonists is also mentioned by Hellanicus (*FGrH* 4 F 32).

36: ῥοᾶν. Pu. reads ῥοάν with MSS. and scholia, but Pindar always uses the plural ῥοαί, and παρὰ ῥοᾶν is obviously parallel to ἀπὸ Σπάρτας, so that we have mentally to supply τὸ αἷμα, as is rightly observed by Bury (who spoils the construction, however, by translating 'mingled near the stream of Ismenus with the blood of ...'; similarly We. 'an Ismenos' Fluten beigemischt').

36: κεκραμένον. Scil. with the blood on the father's side.

37: Μελανίπποιο. Famous opponent of the Seven against Thebes: cf. *KP* III, 1164.16 ff.

37: δέ. Has explanatory (motivating) force: see above, on 19 δέ.

38: ἀμφέροντι. Me. translates 'sie bringen mit sich', but that is φέρομαι (e.g. *P.* 7, 21). Fenn. translates 'return' (similarly Farn. 'revive', 'renew': cf. schol. ἀποφέρονται), but the comparison with cornfields shows that the meaning is 'raise up', 'give forth': cf. ἀναδίδωμι (LSJ II 1) and ἀνίημι (*H.Dem.* 332) said of the earth, ἀνησιδώρα and ἀναξιδώρα said of Demeter (S. fr. 826 and 1010), and A. *Cho.* 447-8 ἀνέφερον ... γόον (where Garvie compares Plut. *Cleom.* 15 αἵματος πλῆθος ἀνενεγκεῖν). The capacities (ἀρεταί) inherent in the γένος are like the fertile soil from which shoot up the achievements (ἀρεταί: see my note on *O.* 3, 18 ἀρετᾶν) of the individual members as flourishing plants (cf. *I.* 5, 17 θάλλοισ' ἀρετά, *O.* 9, 16, *N.* 4, 88, *N.* 10, 42), and the fame of these achievements may be kept alive by the water of the victory ode (*N.* 8, 40-1). See further my note on *O.* 14, 15 Θαλία.

Although the middle ἀμφέρονται is defended by Fenn. by comparing *P.* 7, 21 φέρεσθαι, the active seems to be preferable because it is the regular form of φέρω when said of the earth or of trees: cf. 41 φέρειν and LSJ A V.

38: ἀλλασσόμεναι. Schol.: τοῦ μεταξὺ γένους ἠμαυρωμένου. Alternance is a special form of vicissitude, for which see note on *O.* 1, 100 ὕπατον.

38: γενεαῖς. Dative of interest weakened to 'in the case of': cf. K.G. I, 429, Schw. II, 189.

38: ἀνδρῶν. Not to be connected with σθένος (Sand., We., Lefkowitz, 54), but with γενεαῖς: cf. Hom. Z 149 ὣς ἀνδρῶν γενεὴ ἡ μὲν φύει ἡ δ'

ἀπολήγει. I do not believe that the assonance Πεισάνδρου (33)—ἀνδρῶν is intentional, as is suggested by Barkhuizen, 147.

39: **ἐνσχερώ.** 'Without interruption'. Most editors read ἐν σχερῷ, but Tur. rightly prints ἐνσχερώ: the MSS. do not have a iota here nor at *N.* 1, 69 and *I.* 6, 21. Cf. Ap.Rh. I 912 ἐνσχερώ, Homeric ἐπισχερώ (cf. Schw. II, 469 and n. 1), and Hsch. ἰσχερώ· ἑξῆς[13].

39: **δέ.** Has explanatory (motivating) force: see above, on 19 δέ.

39: **ὦν.** Cf. Denn., 419-20: "οὖν emphasizes the duality, or plurality, of the ideas negativated". Similarly εἴτ' οὖν (Denn., 418-9).

39: **μέλαιναι.** Bury thinks that this word "is chosen with the purpose of pointing the illustration by a play on Μελάνιππος" (similarly Barkhuizen, 147), but μέλαινα is a conventional epithet of γῆ and χθών: cf. Hom. B 699, Hes. *Th.* 69, Alcm. 58, 3, Archil. 58 D. = 130 W., 2, Sa. 1, 10. I also doubt whether A. Kober, *The Use of Colour Terms in the Greek Poets* (New York 1932), 32-3, is right in suggesting that μέλαιναι ἄρουραι implies the idea of fertility. Fogelmark (30) goes too far in maintaining that at *O.* 9, 50 μέλαινα χθών "any thought of black fertile soil is out of the question", but neither there nor in the present line is the idea of fertility clearly relevant to the context (as it is e.g. at Hom. λ 365 and Alcm. 89 P., 3). The epithet is more likely to have a purely decorative function, just as at Archil. 58 D. = 130 W., 2, Sa. 1, 10 and 16, 2, etc.

39: **ἄρουραι.** The same comparison is found at *N.* 6, 8-11. The differences between the two passages suggested by Lefkowitz (54-5) seem to me fanciful.

40: **δένδρεα.** Lefkowitz (54) maintains that a "natural connection is drawn between the crowning of the victor (... ἔρνεσιν, rather than στεφάνοις, 29) and the flowering of the trees". I fail to see where the connection is drawn except in the reader's imagination. For ἔρνεσιν cf. *N.* 6, 18, *I.* 1, 29 and 66.

40: **οὐκ ἐθέλει.** Fenn. rightly translates 'are not wont': see my note on *O.* 11, 9 ἐθέλει. There may be an implication of 'are unable': cf. Hom. Φ 366, γ 121, Sol. 3 D. = 4 W., 27. Lefkowitz (54) thinks that "there is a special emphasis on intention" in the simile; she admits (n. 29) that ἐθέλω "can denote customary behaviour", but argues that "English 'tend' does not adequately convey the verb's sense of volition". But the point is that in such cases the verb has practically lost its sense of volition. Nis. (62) argues that the poem contains "repeated instances of negative volition" and that therefore "the literal connotation, secondary from the point of view of the immediate context, is primary from the point of view

---

[13] Fränkel's translation (573) 'auf der Erdenfeste' is unintelligible.

of the ode as a whole". But the two only evident instances of negative volition are 22-3 and 31-2, both referring to the same fact.

40: περόδοις. One may think of the fact that the trees are in flower at different times during the year, but Pindar probably wished only to avoid such prosaic expressions as κατὰ ἔτος.

41: πλούτῳ. For the limitative force of the dative see above, on 13 μορφᾷ. Wil. (431) wrongly takes πλούτῳ to refer to the fruits ("nicht jedes Jahr entspricht die Ernte der Blütenpracht"): Schr. points out that in that case the text would have πλοῦτον ἄνθει ἴσον. For πλοῦτος 'abundance' cf. LSJ I 2.

41: ἴσον. Mommsen's τ' ἴσον is unnecessary, for ἴσον is construed as a predicate.

42: ἐναμείβοντι. Some editors read ἐν ἀμείβοντι (cf. ἐναλλάξ), but the verb (which further occurs at Lyd. *Mag.* 3, 39) seems to have been modelled after ἐναλλάττω. Pindar might have written ἐπαμείβοντι (cf. Hom. Z 339 νίκη δ' ἐπαμείβεται ἄνδρας), but ἐν- more strongly suggests alternation. For the plural after ἐθέλει cf. Hom. B 135 δοῦρα σέσηπε νεῶν καὶ σπάρτα λέλυνται, and K.G. I, 65-6. For a plural verb after a plural neuter see note on *O.* 10, 85 φάνεν.

42: ἔθνος. A certain emendation: cf. *O.* 1, 66 ἀνέρων ἔθνος, *N.* 3, 74 βρότεον ἔθνος.

42: ἄγει. Bury thinks that this means 'drive', "like wind". One might compare A. *Pers.* 602 τὸν αὐτὸν αἰεὶ δαίμον' οὐριεῖν τύχης, but Moira is a more stable power than Tyche: cf. Strohm, 51 ff., espec. 52: "Sie stellt den ein für allemal festgelegten Grundriss dar". Accordingly, the meaning is 'guides', 'governs': cf. LSJ A II 2-3, Slater, 8.

43: τὸ δέ. Usually connected with ἐκ Διός ('that which comes from Zeus'), either as an accusative of respect or as the subject of the sentence (σαφὲς τέκμαρ being the predicate). This is better than to connect τό with τέκμαρ (Me.), but it seems to me more natural to take τὸ δέ in the sense of 'on the other hand': cf. *O.* 9, 95, *I.* 3, 11, K.G. I, 584. Anyhow, it is important not to neglect the adversative force of δέ (as is done by most translators): the course of life of human generations, just as that of fields and trees, has been fixed by Destiny, but man is unable to foresee the future. This is a *topos* (cf. *N.* 6, 6-7, *I.* 8, 14-5, and see my note on *O.* 12, 8 ἐσσομένας)[14] and as such does not need a special motivation, such as is suggested by Lefkowitz, 56: "the temporary nature of the occasion itself, election to a political office, gives special emphasis to the topics of the limits of achievement, ignorance of the future, mortality, and

---

[14] For Pindar's view of the future see also C. G. Starr, *Essays on Ancient History* (Leiden 1979), 177-8.

change". On the contrary, the comparatively short duration of the office (10 δωδεκάμηνον) implies that these topics are not especially relevant to the occasion.

43: σαφές. 'Reliable' rather than 'clear': see my notes on *O.* 7, 91 σάφα and *O.* 10, 55 σαφανές.

43: ἕπεται. 'Falls to': cf. *P.* 10, 17 ἕποιτο μοῖρα, Hom. Δ 415 τούτῳ κῦδος ἅμ' ἕψεται, LSJ II 2.

44: τέκμαρ. Cf. *P.* 10, 63 τὰ δ' εἰς ἐνιαυτὸν ἀτέκμαρτον προνοῆσαι. This parallel shows that Pindar's outlook upon the limits of human power did not change very much in the course of his life.

Bury (followed by Péron, 42 and n. 1) thinks that τέκμαρ "suggests a guiding star". He compares *H.Hom.* 32, 13, where the moon is called τέκμωρ βροτοῖσι, but even E. *Hec.* 1273 κυνὸς ταλαίνης σῆμα, ναυτίλοις τέκμαρ does not warrant such a conclusion. Pindar is more likely to have Hom. A 525-6 in mind, where Zeus calls his nod μετ' ἀθανάτοισι μέγιστον/τέκμαρ.

44: μεγαλανορίαις. 'Self-confident ambitions': cf. *P.* 8, 90-1 ἐξ ἐλπίδος πέταται / ὑποπτέροις ἀνορέαις, *N.* 3, 20 ἀνορέαις ὑπερτάταις ἐπέβα. We.'s translation 'hochmütig' is misleading, and Strohm's paraphrase "verblendetes Menschentum" (78) is certainly wrong: self-confidence is an ambivalent notion.

44: ἐμβαίνομεν. For the nautical metaphor cf. *N.* 3, 20 quoted above, Pl. *Phdr.* 252 e 5, and Péron, 39 ff.

45: τε. Me. wrongly reads ἔργ' ἅτε (Mommsen). For τε introducing a participial clause Denn. (502) quotes two examples, Lys. 13, 40 ἀφικνεῖται, μέλαν τε ἱμάτιον ἠμφιεσμένη and Pind. *P.* 6, 45-6 πατρῴαν μάλιστα πρὸς στάθμαν ἔβα,/ πάτρῳ τ' ἐπερχόμενος ἀγλαΐαν ἅπασαν. He rightly explains the first τε as equivalent to καὶ ταῦτα, but wrongly thinks that from ἔβα we have to supply βαίνων (similarly Fenn. and Bury): just as ἠμφιεσμένη, ἐπερχόμενος supplies an additional information closely connected with the first part of the sentence. Similarly *P.* 1, 70 υἱῷ τ' ἐπιτελλόμενος, *N.* 8, 19 ἀμπνέων τε (cf. Slater, 489: "almost καὶ ταῦτα")[15]. In the present passage the additional information has an explanatory (specifying) character: for this use of τε see note on *O.* 1, 41.

45: δέδεται. According to Fenn., "perhaps a metaphor from a slave chained to the oar", a view accepted by Bury, but rightly rejected as anachronistic by Péron, 41-2 n. 5. Strohm (78) wrongly sees a paradox in the phrase δέδεται ἐλπίδι γυῖα: the verb does not imply paralysis, as is assumed by Strohm, but only inescapable compulsion, and it may refer

---

[15] Schroeder (on *P.* 1, 75-80) wrongly equates these cases with *O.* 7, 81 and *I.* 2, 38, where the participle is used instead of a finite verb for the sake of variation.

to a holding as well as to a moving force (as is observed by Fränkel, 575 n. 22): cf. *P.* 3, 54 κέρδει καὶ σοφία δέδεται, *P.* 4, 71 κίνδυνος ... δῆσεν, and the phrase 'to be bound to'.

Lefkowitz (55) thinks that the metaphor has been prepared by 15 περιστέλλειν, 16 ἐπιεσσόμενος, 23 ἔσχον, 28 ἀνδησάμενος, 39-40 οὔτ' ἔδωκαν ... οὐκ ἐθέλει, and concludes that "Pindar has elaborated the traditional connotation of binding, which in Homer regularly describes the effect of death and delusion, into a characterization of mental action". But such parallels are too vague to have any demonstrative force.

45: ἀναιδεῖ. Not 'unconscionable' (Fenn.), 'importunate' (Bury), 'insolent' (Farn.), 'wanton' (Bo.), 'shameless' (Latt., Nis., *et al.*), 'frech' (We., Fränkel, 573), 'effrontée' (Pu.), 'insensée' (Péron, 256), but 'knowing no αἰδώς', i.e. 'shrinking from nothing': see note on *O.* 10, 105 ἀναιδέα. Accordingly, the word does not necessarily have a moral connotation, as is assumed by Me. and Lefkowitz, 55.

46: ἐλπίδι. See above, on 22 ἐλπίδες. Strohm (78) maintains that ἐλπίς is depreciated ("abgewertet") here and at *P.* 8, 90 more strongly than elsewhere (*P.* 3, 23, *N.* 1, 33, *N.* 8, 45, *I.* 2, 43), and that a positive appreciation is to be found at *O.* 13, 103, *P.* 3, 111, *I.* 8, 15, fr. 214. Similarly Péron, 42: "l'homme, laissé par les dieux dans une ignorance complète de ce qui l'attend (v. 43), contribue aussi à son propre aveuglement, en se laissant entraîner par l'espérance, puissance d'illusion et d'égarement, à poursuivre des ambitions démesurées, sans rapport avec sa nature, par essence limitée; ἐλπίς a donc une valeur purement 'négative' (v. 46: ἀναιδεῖ)". I have already pointed out that ἀναιδεῖ does not imply criticism: Pindar does not blame man for cherishing far-reaching expectations, but he states the objective fact that ἐλπίς does not have a natural limit because man does not know the future. The result is that in some cases ἐλπίς is too weak (22 ὀκνηρότεραι), in other cases too strong (cf. Bury, 218: "undue diffidence and undue confidence").

The question whether there occurred a change in Pindar's appreciation of ἐλπίς is wrongly put: Pindar did not evaluate ἐλπίς as such[16] but he observed its failures[17] and preached moderation (v. 47). It can only be said that man's ignorance of the future, already signalized in his earlier work (see above, on 44 τέκμαρ), is more strongly emphasized in *P.* 8 (93-5) and *N.* 11 (43-4, 46). The difference, however, is not very great: cf. B. L. Gildersleeve, *Selections from the Brief Mention* (Baltimore-London-Oxford 1930), 59: "For my part, I have not been able to recognize the symptoms of aging in Pindar, which Leopold Schmidt has dwelt upon in such detail. P. VIII is bitter, or, if you choose, austere, but the

---

[16] As is rightly observed by J. J. A. Schrijen, *Elpis* (Groningen 1965), 60.
[17] For its connection with τύχη cf. F. J. Nisetich, TAPA 107 (1977), 247 ff.

melancholy of the latest piece is matched by the melancholy of the earliest''. Gund. (*Mnem.*, 5) and Lefkowitz (52, 56) make much of the fact that an αἴγλα διόσδοτος (*P.* 8, 96) does not appear in *N.* 11, and that there is no trace of a similarity between men and gods (*N.* 6, 3), but faith in divine help is implicitly expressed at 5 and 8.

I doubt whether Pindar's view of human weakness should be called 'tragic', as is done by Strohm (79): ''Der Mensch *kann* ja wesensgemäss gar nicht anders als gegen das ebenso wesensgemässe Gesetz seiner Bedingtheit verstossen'' (similarly Fränkel, 575). But 47 χρή implies that man *can* try to observe this law by aiming at moderation (as is implicitly admitted by Strohm, *ibid.*). Foreknowledge is difficult, but possible to some extent: see below, on 46 ἀπόκεινται. Consequently, Péron (130 and 257) is wrong in thinking that *N.* 11 is concluded by ''un véritable aveu d'impuissance''. That the term 'pessimism' is equally inappropriate has been pointed out by de Vries, 156-7 (= 104-5) and Mnem. IV 10 (1957), 8-15, who rightly observes that *I.* 7, 37 is counterbalanced by 38, and *P.* 8, 95 by 96-7. Even the phrase 'resigned pessimism' (Bury, 218) is misleading, for it may induce us to underestimate Pindar's faith in man's power to crown his life with lasting values.

46: γυῖα. Nisetich (above, n. 16), 247, suggests that this implies the idea of mortality, but elsewhere in Pindar the word more often refers to athletics than to death. In the present passage it seems to continue the image of 44 ἐμβαίνομεν.

46: προμαθείας. Not 'precaution' (We. 'Vorsicht', Fränkel, 574 'sorglicher Voraussicht'), but 'foreknowledge': cf. *O.* 7, 44, where αἰδώς ('restraint': see above, on 45 ἀναιδεῖ) is said to be characteristic of the προμαθής.

46: δέ. Has explanatory (motivating) force (see above, on 19 δέ): ἐλπίς does not know limits because it does not know the future[18].

46: ἀπόκεινται. Not 'sind verborgen' (Me.) or 'are beyond our reach' (Pu. 'se dérobent à nous', Péron, 257 'être à l'écart'), but 'are far away', i.e. are difficult to reach. A small degree of foreknowledge is not denied to man: cf. *I.* 1, 40 ὁ πονήσαις δὲ νόῳ καὶ προμάθειαν φέρει.

46: ῥοαί. Not 'the tides of events lie beyond our foresight' (LSJ I), but to be connected with προμαθείας. The image of streams or waves is often used of destiny (cf. Péron, 251 ff.), but its connection with foreknowledge is not immediately clear. Fenn.'s observation that ''no doubt the mariners of Tenedos were familiar with and often grateful to the

---

[18] Schrijen (above, n. 16), 56, wrongly explains the connection as adversative: ''hope is shameless, but one should try to avoid shamelessness by bearing in mind that the human power of forethought is very weak''.

strong Hellespontine current'' seems to me irrelevant. Péron (256-7), who rightly rejects the translation 'sources' (We., Fränkel, 574), argues that the phrase ''ne constitue en effet que le dernier élément d'un tableau dominé par la présence de la mer''; he compares *O.* 12, 5-6, but there human expectations are compared with ships, not with waves. If we translate the word by 'rivers' (Bury *et al.*), we may compare *I.* 2, 41-2, where the Phasis and the Nile are mentioned as symbols for remote parts of the world (cf. Péron, 85-7).

47: κερδέων. 'Desires of gain': cf. *P.* 3, 54 κέρδει καὶ σοφία δέδεται, *N.* 9, 33 αἰδὼς γὰρ ὑπὸ κρύφα κέρδει κλέπτεται, LSJ I 2. Warning against pursuit of gain is a *topos* in Pindar: cf. *P.* 1, 92, *P.* 2, 78, *P.* 4, 139-40, and Péron, 210-1. For the desiderative use of the substantive see note on *O.* 1, 56 κόρῳ.

47: δέ. Strongly adversative (neglected in almost all translations): human aspirations and expectations tend to overstep all limits, but all the same they (κερδέων is a specification of μενοινῶντες and ἐλπίδι) should keep within bounds, for else they lead nowhere (48 ἀπροσίκτων).

47: μέτρον. Cf. *O.* 13, 47-8 ἕπεται δ' ἐν ἑκάστῳ / μέτρον, *P.* 2, 34 χρὴ δὲ κατ' αὐτὸν αἰεὶ παντὸς ὁρᾶν μέτρον. For the similar doctrine of καιρός see note on *I.* 2, 22. It is misleading to say that ''the domestic safe-mindedness which was disparaged formerly is the poet's present object of praise'' (Hubbard, 59): success is based on divine favour, natural abilities, exertion, and wealth, but also on the courage of taking risks (see above, on 32 ἄτολμος). Pindar's lesson is not safe-mindedness, but moderation.

The above parallels show that the end of the poem is a *topos*. It is wrong to assume that this must have a special application, as is done by Farn. (234), who supposes ''that the kinsmen of Aristagoras being aware of his weaknesses had suggested to Pindar to convey this to him'', and by Me., who thinks that the warning is addressed to ''den Teil der Bürgerschaft, der überstürzenden Neuerungen zugethan ist'', and that the praise of Aristagoras serves the purpose ''die Warnung an die Unruhestifter recht eindringlich zu machen''.

47: θηρευέμεν. To be contrasted with *P.* 3, 23 μεταμώνια θηρεύων ἀκράντοις ἐλπίσιν. On Pindar's use of metaphors of hunting cf. C. J. Classen, *Untersuchungen zu Platons Jagdbildern* (Berlin 1960), 6-7.

48: ἀπροσίκτων. Not 'ad quem accedere non licet, inexpugnabilis' (Rumpel with schol.; cf. ἄπλατος), nor 'unattainable' (Bury, LSJ, who wrongly take ἐρώτων to be 'objects of desire', Slater), nor depending on ἐρώτων (Christ), but 'not reaching their end', 'achieving nothing'. For the verbal adjective used with active force cf. Kühner-Blass II, 289, Bruhn, § 101, Wackernagel I, 136, 288, Pearson on S. fr. 534, 4, Barrett on E. *Hipp.* 678.

The phrase belongs to the *topos* of confining one's ambitions to objects within one's reach: cf. *O.* 1, 69 ἑτοῖμον, 114 μηκέτι πάπταινε πόρσιον (similarly *O.* 3, 44, *P.* 3, 21-2), *P.* 3, 62 τὰν δ' ἔμπρακτον ἄντλει μαχανάν, *P.* 10, 62 τυχὼν κεν ἁρπαλέαν σχέθοι φροντίδα τὰν πὰρ ποδός (where the potential optative is equivalent to an adhortative subjunctive: cf. K.G. I, 233-4, Bruhn, § 113), *N.* 3, 75 φρονεῖν δ' ἐνέπει τὸ παρκείμενον (similarly *I.* 8, 12).

Hubbard (11-27) devotes a special paragraph to the contrast 'near-far', but he seems to me wrong in arguing that "it is only through past desire for what is beyond that their [the victors'] present glory is possible" (11). He refers to *I.* 6, 71 μέτρα μὲν γνώμᾳ διώκων, μέτρα δὲ καὶ κατέχων, but this passage does not express "a complex dialectical tension between pursuit and restraint" (11). The victors may in reality have felt such a tension, but it is misleading to say (12) that "it is the custom of the victory ode to mediate this tension". Pindar simply presents a picture of their father, who is a model of moderation (cf. 72-3). This may be an indirect way of preaching moderation, but the poet does not consider the psychological background of moderation.

48: ἐρώτων. Used in its general sense of 'desires', but especially 'desires of gain' (cf. 47 κερδέων). The genitive has been explained in various ways, none of which seems to me convincing: (1) gen. of object: 'aber die Gier nach unerfüllbaren Wünschen brennt allzuheiss' (Wil., 431). But (a) according to LSJ μανία with objective genitive does not occur before Hermesianax; (b) 'allzu' apparently means that μανία always prevents the attainment of μέτρον, a conclusion which makes χρή a sarcastic paradox and which attributes to Pindar an unparalleled negativism. The suggestion put forward by Gundert (*Mnem.*, 5), that the poet was "in innerem Kampf", does not solve this difficulty.

(2) Gen. of subject: 'schlimm ist das wahnsinnige Begehren unerreichbarer Wünsche' (Me.), 'Unerreichbares Sehnen ist der schneidendste Wahn' (Dorns.), 'vom unerreichbaren Begehr aber ist heftiger der Wahnsinn' (Gund., *Mnem.*, 4), 'Doch unerfüllbares Begehren tobt in umso heftigerem Wahn' (Fränkel, 574, explained, 575, by "Wir sollen uns bescheiden, und doch brennt kein Sehnen so heiss wie der Wahnwunsch nach dem Unerreichbaren"), 'Too sharp is the madness of unattainable desires' (Nis.; similarly Lefkowitz, 56), 'qui se laisse aller à des ambitions irréalisables s'expose à une démence éperdue' (Pu.). But (a) the meaning of these translations and their connection with the preceding words is unclear, and (b) some of them suggest that the μέτρον is never attained (cf. Gund.'s explanation, *Mnem.*, 5: "Die kurze Mahnung zum Mass geht unter in dem Schluss"): see above, under 1 b.

(3) Gen. of origin: 'Sharp are the fits of madness wrought by unat-

tainable longings' (Bury; similarly de Vries, 152, = 101, and Mnem. IV 36 (1983), 153), 'From longings unachievable cometh madness passing fell' (Fenn.), 'Too bitter are the pangs of madness after loves that are past attainment' (Latt.), 'Loves beyond reach sting too sharply to madness' (Bo.), 'Unerfüllbare Gier ruft heftigeren Wahn nur hervor' (We.). But these translations, like most of the ones classed under 2, leave us in the dark about the question whether δέ has adversative or motivating force. If it is adversative, see under 1 b; if motivating, it may be doubted whether the prospect of increasing insanity would be a sufficient incentive to aim at moderation. De Vries (156, = 104-5, and Mnem., *loc. cit.*) rightly takes the connection to be motivating, and he tries to explain it by translating ὀξύτεραι as 'extra sharp', which he takes to be equivalent to 'smarting' ('schrijnend'). It is true that ὀξύς may be said of mental pains (*N.* 1, 53 ὀξείαις ἀνίαισι τυπείς, Hom. τ 517 ὀξεῖαι μελεδῶνες ὀδυρομένην ἐρέθουσιν), but I doubt whether "the current equalization of μανία and νόσος" (de Vries, Mnem., *loc. cit.*) is a sufficient argument: many (and perhaps most) patients do not experience their mania as a disease.

The above difficulties may be avoided by taking ὀξύτεραι in the sense of 'too violent' (see above, on 22 ὀκνηρότεραι), and ἐρώτων as a partitive genitive: 'For mad passions whose violence exceeds the measure (advocated in the preceding sentence) belong to the domain of unrealizable desires'. For the fact that μανία disregards due measure cf. Hom. ι 38-9 τὸ καυχᾶσθαι παρὰ καιρὸν / μανίαισιν ὑποκρέκει. For the genitive expressing the idea of 'belonging to' cf. e.g. Pl. *Euthyd.* 277 c 5 τῶν λαμβανόντων ἄρ' εἰσὶν οἱ μανθάνοντες, ἀλλ' οὐ τῶν ἐχόντων; see further K.G. I, 372, Schw. II, 122-3. For the ellipse of εἰσίν cf. K.G. I, 40-2, Groeneboom on A. *Pr.* 42 and 549, Fraenkel on A. *Ag.* 264, de Vries on Pl. *Phdr.* 227 c 4. De Vries (Mnem., *loc.cit.*) objects that this interpretation makes Pindar conclude his poem with a truism. But we have already seen (above, on ἀπροσίκτων) that the sentence contains a *topos*, and a *topos* certainly forms a dignified conclusion.

ISTHMIAN 2

Date

The past tense of lines 37 ff. shows that the poem has been composed after the death of Xenocrates (about 472)[1]. It seems to have been commissioned by his son Thrasybulus for some memorial celebration of his father's victories, and such a celebration is most likely to have taken place not too long after the victor's death. See further below, on 43 **ἐλπίδες**.

Metre

The dactyloepitrites do not present special problems. At the end of 14 etc. we find a choriambus after epitrites, a fact which supports the view of those critics who accept the correspondence of these metres: see above, pp. 87, 97.

Composition

See the Commentary, *passim*.

Commentary

1: Θρασύβουλε. Son of Xenocrates of Agrigentum. A. Kambylis, *Anredeformen bei Pindar*, in *Χάρις Κ. Ι. Βουρβέρη* (Athens 1964) [95-199], 181 n. 3, points out that this is the only Pindaric poem in which a human being is addressed in the first line. The exception seems to me to be connected with the fact that the poem, although it is a real victory ode (see below, n. 28), has a strongly personal character (see below, on 12 σοφός and 48 ἠθαῖον).

1: φῶτες. See note on *O.* 1, 46 φῶτες.

1: χρυσαμπύκων. Cf. Hes. *Th.* 916 Μοῦσαι χρυσάμπυκες. The mention of the hair-band (cf. West on *Th.* 578) does not seem to have a special significance: χρυσάμπυξ is also said of the Horae (*H. Hom.* 6, 5), Lachesis (Pind. *O.* 7, 64), Urania (Bacch. 5, 13), and Artemis is said to have χρυσέαν ἄμπυκα (E. *Hec.* 465)[2]. Gold is a symbol of radiance and

---

[1] P. Von der Mühll, *Ausgewählte kleine Schriften* (Basel 1975), 234, observes that Xenocrates may have died before Thero (472), but Priv. (XXIX and 27) seems to me to go too far in concluding from the fact that Thero's death is not mentioned in the poem that it was composed before that date.

[2] M. S. Silk, *Interaction in Poetic Imagery* (Cambridge 1974), 154, thinks that 2 δίφρον is "prepared by χρυσαμπύκων, via the association of -αμπύκων with horses". But ἄμπυξ

imperishability (cf. fr. 222 Διὸς παῖς ὁ χρυσός· κεῖνον οὐ σὴς οὐδὲ κὶς δάπτει), and therefore is characteristic of the possessions of the gods (see my notes on *O.* 3, 19 χρυσάρματος and 42 αἰδοιέστατος), and even of the gods themselves (see below, on 26 χρυσέας)[3]. Simpson (472) thinks that Pindar contrasts a golden age of poetry with a more recent silver age (8 ἀργυρωθεῖσαι), just as Hesiod contrasted the golden age and the silver age of mankind, but the text does not suggest such a qualitative difference: on the contrary, the epithets γλυκεῖαι, μελίφθογγοι, μαλθακόφωνοι (7-8) denote the highest poetical qualities. It cannot be maintained either that there is "a preference felt throughout the poem for a past now lost when ideal poetry flourished" (Simpson, *ibid.*). See further below, on 46 ἐλινύσοντας.

2: δίφρον. For the image of the Muses' chariot see note on *O.* 1, 110 ἅρματι.

2: κλυτᾷ. The common translation 'loud' does not seem to be very relevant in this context, and evident parallels are scarce (Simon. 597 of a swallow, Hsch. κλυτὰ ὄρνις of a cock). 'Glorious' (Pu., Thu., Slater, Nis.) suggests a kind of epic grandeur (cf. Hom. ζ 58 κλυτὰ εἵματα, ι 308 κλυτὰ μῆλα), but may at the same time have the causative overtone of 'glorifying'[4]: see my notes on *O.* 1, 105 κλυταῖσι and *O.* 14, 21 κλυτάν.

2: συναντόμενοι. 'Meeting', hence 'cooperating with': cf. *O.* 2, 95-6 χόρος / οὐ δίχᾳ συναντόμενος[5]. For the spatial expression see notes on *O.* 1, 22 προσέμειξε, *O.* 10, 42 ἀντάσαις. Thu. writes that Pindar uses the participle instead of σύν "um einer Aussage Schmuck und Nachdruck zu verleihen". This explanation is too vague: Pindar tries to make his descriptions as graphic and dynamic as possible. For parallels cf. Dorns., *P.S.*, 94-6, who is wrong, however, in speaking of "farblose Zeitwörter"[6]: cf. Gildersleeve, *Olympian and Pythian Odes*, XLI: "It is hardly possible to go wrong in pressing Pindar's vocabulary until the blood comes".

I do not understand how Th. Hoey, HSCP 70 (1965), 235, can quote this phrase as showing that "agents seem to be operated from without":

---

is only once (by Quint. Smyrn.!) used with reference to horses and neither *O.* 13, 15 χρυσάμπυκα χαλινόν nor *O.* 5, 7 μοναμπυκίᾳ warrants the assumption of a special association of -αμπύκων with horses.

[3] The word has been omitted by Nis., perhaps for poetic reasons, but in my opinion a translator should never sacrifice content to form.

[4] Cf. Simpson, 470 'ennobling'. Priv. goes too far in suggesting that 'famous' and 'glorifying' exclude one another.

[5] 'Saluting them [the Muses] with the proud-sounding lyre' (Conway) is certainly wrong. 'Accompanied by' (e.g. Bo., Priv.) is too weak.

[6] Similarly Bowra, 226-8 and Fränkel, 565-6, who speaks of "der absichtlichen Vagheit einer langen Reihe von Ausdrücken des Kontakts".

the poet who 'joins' the phorminx does not become passive, but conversely the instrument, which is a passive object, becomes a partner of the poet, in accordance with the importance attached by Pindar to music. From this point of view such translations as 'indem sie sich an die Phorminx machten' (Me.) and 'pour prendre en main le noble phorminx' (Pu.) are misleading.

3: **ῥίμφα.** 'Quickly and easily', hence 'spontaneously' (Farn., Simpson, 471, Nisetich, 140).

3: **παιδείους.** 'Addressed to youths' (Fenn.): cf. *I.* 1, 16 Καστορείῳ ὕμνῳ, and the use of adjectives equivalent to the genitive of a substantive (see my notes on *O.* 7, 19 'Αργεία and *O.* 10, 15 Κύκνεια). Pindar thinks of the erotic poems of Alcman, Ibycus, Alcaeus (schol.), but he does not want to suggest that lyric poetry in older times was predominantly erotic, or even that good poetry is characterized by "homosexual purity" (Simpson, 472): he mentions the erotic poems as outstanding examples of spontaneity and disinterestedness. Consequently, it is wrong to conclude that the present poem must have an erotic aspect[7]. Pindar and Thrasybulus were no doubt close friends (48), but neither *P.* 6 nor fr. 124 point to erotic feelings[8]. Nisetich (139-40) thinks that 4 καλός implies a compliment paid to Thrasybulus' beauty and that "this implies that Thrasyboulos, if he had lived then, would have been the subject of erotic songs, and that Pindar would have written them in his honor". He (141) even takes 6 ff. to imply: "I write out of love a song that is bought and paid for". This is pressing the evidence beyond measure.

3: **ἐτόξευον.** For the image of the poem as an arrow see note on *O.* 1, 112 βέλος, where I have argued that the point of the comparison is the idea of hitting the mark. Thu. writes: "Die Leichtigkeit, mit der die Dichter von einst ... ihre Lieder schufen und verschickten, kommt im Bild des beweglichen Bogenschützen gut zum Ausdruck", but this is at most a secondary implication: see n. 87 on *O.* 1[9].

---

[7] As is done by Wil., 311-2. Similarly Thu.: "Es konnte wohl nicht anders sein, als dass Thrasybulos aus diesen Worten heraushörte: Wenn sich für einen Dichter der alten Zeit die Gelegenheit ergeben hätte, einen Mann wie dich zu besingen ...". On the other hand, Priv. is equally wrong in thinking that "Pindaro allude, per sineddoche, ad ogni tipo di canto celebrativo".

[8] As is still assumed by Von der Mühll (above, n. 1), 233. But cf. Farn. I, 248-9, Pavese, 105-6. Bury and Von der Mühll (231 and 233-4) think that ἐρατός at 31 and fr. 124, 1 has an erotic implication, but see below, on 31 ἐρατῶν. Nisetich (135) suggests that the mention of Thrasybulus at the beginning shows that "the relationship between the erotic theme and the man to whom the ode is addressed is closer in *Isthmian* 2" than in *N.* 8, but speaking to a person about love does not imply that this person is or has been loved by the speaker.

[9] Simpson (472) is certainly wrong in suggesting that "the chariot-bow metaphor, moreover, embodies an aristocratic concept of poetry in contrast to the falsely pretty poetry of a commercialized age".

3: **μελιγάρυας**. See notes on *O*. 11, 4 μελιγάρυες and *N*. 11, 18 μελιγδούποισι.

3: **ὕμνους**. Von der Mühll, *op. cit.* (above, n. 7), 285-6, and F. Lasserre, *Ornements érotiques dans la poésie lyrique*, in *Serta Turyniana* (Urbana-Chicago-London 1974), 5 ff., have tried to revive a theory put forward by Welcker in 1834, viz. that the expression of erotic feelings in poems addressed to beautiful youths was a formal homage[10]. Lasserre (18) argues that this view is corroborated by the use of ὕμνος, which in Pindar always implies praise and so cannot mean 'love song'. The fact that in Pindar's time poets were paid for such ἐγκώμια does not imply, however, that they could not at the same time use them to express their personal feelings. Such passionate words as fr. 103, 10-12 make an impression of genuineness, and a reaction such as "wir wissen es nicht" (Von der Mühll, 236) is an excess of scepticism. For erotic feelings in Pindar's works see further my notes on *O*. 1, 41 ἱμέρῳ and *O*. 10, 99 ἐρατόν.

4: **ὅστις**. Equivalent to εἴ τις: cf. *P*. 3, 22, K.G. II, 441-2, S. L. Radt on Hipp. *VM* 51, 7, Mnem. IV 32 (1979), 106.

5: **εὐθρόνου**. In Homer an epithet of Eos. Similarly ἀγλαόθρονος, χρυσόθρονος, ποικιλόθρονος. Cf. Page on Sappho 1, 1, who shows that these terms do not refer to cult-statues, but emphasize the god's Olympian status (similarly Bowra, 217-8)[11].

5: **μνάστειραν**. 'Reminding one of Aphrodite' (schol. μνήμην ἐμποιοῦσαν; cf. *P*. 12, 24 μναστῆρα ἀγώνων and Farn. *ad. loc.*), i.e. arousing one's erotic feelings[12]. For the causative use see above, on 2 κλυτᾷ. The translations 'mindful of' (LSJ; so probably *N*. 1, 16 πολέμου μναστῆρα λαόν) and 'wooing' (Bury, Bo.; so probably fr. 19 ἀγῶνα μνασιστέφανον, fr. 210 φιλοτιμίαν μνώμενοι) are less appropriate, for the youths are obviously considered to be objects of love[13].

5: **ὀπώραν**. 'Ripeness' (cf. *N*. 5, 6, LSJ III), a more choice term than ἥβαν.

---

[10] Cf. Von der Mühll, 235: "reine gesellschaftliche Huldigung" ... 236: "die Form der Kundgebung steht in einer gesellschaftlichen Tradition; diese verlangt, dass man so tut, als wäre man verliebt".

[11] See further H. Jung, *Thronende und sitzende Götter* (Bonn 1982), and the review by P. Kranz, Gnom. 57 (1985), 61-6.

The epithet is not translated by Nis.: see above, n. 2.

[12] Thu. rightly points out that the effect of beauty is meant, but his translation 'Mahnerin' (similarly Dorns.) is not very happy. Nis.'s translation 'had the bloom of Aphrodite's flower in his cheeks' obscures the construction of the Greek.

[13] Köhnken (*Mythos*, 139) defends the translation 'mindful of' by comparing *N*. 8, 1 Ὥρα πότνια, κάρυξ Ἀφροδίτας ἀμβροσιᾶν φιλοτάτων, but there the youths are subjects of love (cf. 2 παρθενηΐοις παίδων τε).

6: **ἐργάτις.** 'Working for money': cf. ἐργασία 'trade', 'business' (LSJ II 3). Wil. (311 n. 1) thinks that the word suggests 'prostitute', because Archilochus (206 W.) used it in that sense, but such a sarcasm does not suit Pindar's style nor his mood[14]. Thu. argues that Pindar is so dependent on the Muse "dass der Dichter ... gewissermassen für sie das Geld eintreiben muss, um sie überhaupt zum Sprechen zu bringen. Pindar führt also eine Anklage gegen seine Gebieterin und erhöht damit den Wert seiner Arbeit, die er ungeachtet der schlechten Arbeitsbedingungen ausführt". This interpretation is obviously absurd, but it is the logical product of the fixed idea which determines Thu.'s view of Pindar's poetry: every detail of a victory ode is subordinate to the purpose of praise[15], and here the poet introduces a "Hindernismotiv" to enhance his own glory. But 33 shows that the poet does not feel hindered by any difficulties[16].

7: **γλυκεῖαι.** It is not clear whether Nis.'s 'wanton' is meant as a translation of γλυκεῖαι or of μαλθακόφωνοι, but in both cases it is incorrect. For the *topos* of sweetness see note on *O.* 1, 19 γλυκυτάταις.

7: **μελίφθογγοι.** Heyne's emendation μελιφθόγγου is unnecessary: for the cumulation of adjectives Thu. compares fr. 76 (cf. also *P.* 5, 90-3), but he is wrong in thinking that in the present passage it illustrates "die mühsame Arbeit des Dichters": it rather emphasizes the contrast between the traditional beauty of the songs and the changed character of the Muse. For the compound see above, on 3 μελιγάρυας.

7: **Τερψιχόρας.** This name has perhaps been chosen because Pindar thinks of choral poetry: cf. *N.* 3, 83, where fame is said to be due to Κλεώ. On the other hand, at *O.* 10, 14 Calliope does not have a special function, and Priv. is right in arguing that "l'opposizione non è tra Muse diverse, dell'amore e della lirica corale, ma tra passato e presente".

8: **ἀργυρωθεῖσαι.** This does not refer to cosmetic (see above, n. 13) or ornaments (Fenn.), but to payment, as appears from *N.* 10, 43

[14] Wil. further believes that 7 ἐπέρναντο suggests πόρνη (cf. Nis. 'saunter from melodious Terpsichora's shop into the market place'), but the use of this verb is so common that it can hardly contain such an allusion. Wil.'s view has been adopted by H. Schmitz, *Hypsos und Bios* (Bern 1970), 46 and n. 177, and by Simpson (470-1) who, developing the explanation of ἀργυρωθεῖσαι given by the schol., πρόσωπον κεκοσμημέναι καὶ λαμπρυνθεῖσαι ὅτι τὰ ὤνια ὡς τῶν πωλούντων τὰ πρόσωπα κοσμοῦνται (similarly Bury, Bowra, 356), adds the suggstion that 8 ἀργυρωθεῖσαι may refer to the custom of prostitutes of whitening their faces (cf. Ar. *Eccl.* 878), so that the implication is that "bad poetry possesses an artificial cosmetic prettiness". But silver is not the same as ψιμύθιον.

[15] For a criticism of this idea cf. S. L. Radt, Mnem. IV 25 (1972), 196. Still, Nisetich (139) accepts "Bundy's principle that everything the poet does must somehow redound to the victor's credit" as "a true premiss".

[16] See also the critical remarks made by Nisetich, 138.

ἀργυρωθέντες ('covered with silver', i.e. rewarded) σὺν οἰνηραῖς φιάλαις and *P.* 11, 41-2 Μοῖσα ... εἰ μισθοῖο συνέθου παρέχειν φωνὰν ὑπάργυρον (cf. also S. *Ant.* 1077 εἰ κατηργυρωμένος λέγω). According to the schol., Pindar borrowed the usage from Anacreon 384 P. οὐδ' ἀργυρῆ κω τότ' ἔλαμπε Πειθώ. Priv. argues that "avere il volto d'argento equivaleva ad avere un volto bello e prezioso", and even that "un ode dall'aspetto argenteo aveva una *voce* bella e preziosa come l'argento". He compares Alcm. 1, 55 P. ἀργύριον πρόσωπον, but there the meaning probably is 'radiant': cf. ἀργυρόπεζα said of Thetis (Hom.) and Aphrodite (Pind. *P.* 9, 9). Similarly Pind. fr. 287 Μοῖσαι ἀργύρεαι. For ὑπ- Priv. compares Pl. *Rep.* 415 c, but there the reference is to value, not to beauty.

8: **πρόσωπα.** 'Appearance' (Woodbury, 528 n. 3) is too vague: Pindar thinks of the façade of a building, just as at *O.* 6, 3 and *P.* 6, 14 (cf. LSJ I 2). For the image of the ode as a building cf. also *P.* 3, 113, *P.* 7, 1, *N.* 3, 4. Farn. and Bowra (355-6) think that masks are alluded to (cf. LSJ III 1), but these are irrelevant in the context of choral poetry. For the construction cf. *I.* 3, 87 λευκωθεὶς κάρα, K.G. I, 316.

8: **μαλθακόφωνοι.** Cf. *P.* 8, 31 φθέγματι μαλθακῷ, *N.* 9, 49 μαλθακᾷ σὺν ἀοιδᾷ. Kaimio (150) argues that in these cases "the adjective does not seem to refer actually to a quality of sound, but to a quality of the whole song, including and emphasizing its contents, 'gentle' to the ear in the sense that they are caressing, sympathizing, commendatory, pleasing". It is true that at *P.* 1, 97-8 κοινανίαν μαλθακάν the word seems to mean 'kind', but Arist. *Aud.* 803 a 5 ff. contrasts μαλακός with σκληρός ('harsh') used of sounds which are produced by βία τοῦ πνεύματος. Kaimio's question, "why should a song celebrating victories and other great achievements be sung with a 'soft, gentle' voice?", seems to be answered by Arist. *Aud.* 803 a 24 ff. διὸ καὶ πάντες, ὅταν κωμάζωσιν, ἀνιᾶσιν ἐν τῇ σάλπιγγι τὴν τοῦ πνεύματος συντονίαν, ὅπως ἂν ποιῶσι τὸν ἦχον ὡς μαλακώτατον. See below, on 31 κώμων. Cf. also Hubbard, 73.

9: **νῦν.** Pavese (111) is certainly wrong in thinking that this refers "non ad un presente generico, ma al presente momento celebrativo" (similarly Woodbury, 542 n. 25).

9: **ἐφίητι.** Scil. Terpsichore.

9: **τό.** 'The well-known': cf. *P.* 1, 5 τόν, K.G. I, 598.

9: **Ἀργείου.** Aristodemus. He seems to have been a Spartan (cf. D.L. I 30-31, Alc. fr. 360)[17], and Bury is probably right in assuming that Pindar made him an Argive in order to create a pun ἄργυρος —Ἀργεῖος. This is corroborated by Barkhuizen (100), who compares *O.* 9, 88-90 Ἄργει ... ἀργυρίδεσσιν and *N.* 10, 40-3 Ἄργει ... ἀργυρωθέντες.

---

[17] See further Gianotti, 92-3 and n. 31.

9: **φυλάξαι.** 'Observe': cf. *O.* 3, 41 φυλάσσοντες μακάρων τελετάς, LSJ B 3.

10: **ἀλαθείας.** Becker (97) is probably right in taking this to refer to true reality rather than to truth as a quality of human statements. For this use of ἀλήθεια see my note on *O.* 7, 69 ἐν ἀλαθείᾳ πετοῖσαι ('realized'). On the other hand, Becker seems to me wrong in concluding that "die Wirklichkeit dem Blick nicht offen liegt, sondern verstellt ist": Pindar does not mean that Aristodemus approached the knowledge of the true nature of wealth, but that he best expressed its importance in words.

Fenn. and Tur. add ὁδῶν (cf. *P.* 3, 103 ἀλαθείας ὁδόν), but this is unattractive from a palaeographical point of view. Most editors add ἐτᾶς (=ἐτεᾶς), which is probably correct: cf. *O.* 10, 53 ἀλάθειαν ἐτήτυμον, *N.* 5,17 ἀλάθει' ἀτρεκής[18]. Bury suggests that ἐτᾶς refers to the equivalence of χρήματα and ἄργυρος (cf. e.g. A. *Cho.* 948-9 ἐτήτυμος Διὸς κόρα, Δίκαν), but the word may have been added for the sake of emphasis. For ἐτεός 'genuine' cf. LSJ II[19].

10: **ἄγχιστα βαῖνον.** This phrase is less common than the translation 'coming nearest' suggests. Pindar imagines his songs as going their ways (cf. Becker, 70 ff.), and he apparently applied the same view to a casual remark which had got the status of a proverb[20]. On the other hand, the spatial imagery is a mannerism: see note on *O.* 1, 22 προσέμειξε.

According to Priv., the phrase implies that "Pindaro sottolinea che in realtà l'uomo si identifica col suo valore, non con le sue ricchezze". This is an over-subtle interpretation: it is true that Pindar does not regard wealth as a value in itself (see note on *N.* 11, 13 ὄλβον), but such a reservation is irrelevant in the present context.

11: **χρήματα ... φίλων.** The idea is first expressed at Hom. λ 359-60 πλειοτέρῃ σὺν χειρὶ ... καί κ' αἰδοιότερος καὶ φίλτερος ἀνδράσιν εἴην. Cf. also Hes. *Op.* 313, Bias 10, 3 (VS I, 65.10), Alc. 360, S. fr. 88. A poor man looses his friends because friendship is maintained by the reciprocity of benefits[21].

---

[18] Thu. is inclined to read ἐτὰν ἀλάθειαν (instead of ἒ τάν) at *N.* 7, 25, but his observation that ἀλάθεια is always used without article in Pindar is not decisive ('Αλάθεια is a divine person and as such may have the article, just as *P.* 4, 286 ὁ Καιρός), and his conclusion that "es nach der Aussage von N. VII 25 nicht möglich ist, die volle Wahrheit, bzw. Wirklichkeit zu erkennen" is wrong, for ὅμιλος ὁ πλεῖστος is not everyone.

[19] See further Luther, 51 ff., J. P. Levet, *Le vrai et le faux dans la pensée grecque*, I (Paris 1976), 165-80.

[20] Becker (97) rightly explains the phrase, but does not mention an exact parallel.

[21] Cf. H. Bolkestein, *Wohltätigkeit und Armenpflege im vorchristlichen Altertum* (Utrecht 1939), 162. His examples show that this custom is not confined to the world of Pindar, as is assumed by Woodbury (541), who is also wrong in taking the phrase to imply that "there can be no fame without the approval of generous and approving friends": the loss of friends is mentioned only to emphasize the importance of money. There is not even an implication of the poet's losing his friends, as is assumed by G. Kurz, *Humor bei Pindar*, in *Musa iocosa: Festschrift A. Thierfelder* (Hildesheim 1974), 13.

The repetition (*anadiplosis*) of χρήματα has a pathetic effect: cf. *I*. 6, 44 νῦν σε, νῦν ..., Fehling, 168-70.

11: ὅς. Fenn. and Bury take this to be demonstrative, but the relative pronoun may be postponed: cf. *O*. 9, 33-4 ῥάβδον, βρότεα σώμαθ' ᾇ κατάγει, *P*. 2, 4-5 τετραορίας ..., εὐάρματος Ἱέρων ἐν ᾇ κρατέων.

11: λειφθείς. 'Left behind by', 'bereft from': cf. S. *Ant*. 548 σοῦ λελειμένη, E. *Alc*. 406, *El*. 474.

12: γάρ. Thu. takes this to have affirmative force (see below, on 30 καὶ γάρ), but in that case the asyndeton is difficult to explain. The same objection applies to Denn.'s idea (446), adopted by Slater and Priv., of taking γάρ as looking forward[22]. I prefer to take it as referring back to the unexpressed idea of 'I need say no more'. Similarly Fenn., Bury, Farn., Nisetich, 142 and 155 nn. 49 and 51, who compares *O*. 2, 83-5 and S. *El*. 290. See further Denn., 61-2, S. L. Radt on Ar. *Plut*. 422, Mnem. IV 29 (1976), 256-7.

12: ὦν. Denn., 446: "In post-Homeric Greek οὖν adds to γάρ the idea of importance and essentiality".

12: σοφός. 'A connoisseur' (of poetry): cf. *P*. 6, 49 (Thrasybulus uses) σοφίαν ἐν μυχοῖσι Πιερίδων. For this meaning of σοφός see my note on *O*. 11, 19 ἀκρόσοφον and the references given in Mnem. IV 36 (1983), 23 n. 50[23]. For interest in poetry and music as a *topos* of praise cf. 30-2, and see further notes on *O*. 1, 15 μουσικᾶς, *O*. 10, 14 Καλλιόπα, *N*. 11, 7 λύρα.

As a connoisseur of poetry Thrasybulus is supposed to understand the hidden meaning of the introduction. This meaning is still a subject of discussion. I have already dismissed the idea that the introduction is a "Hindernismotiv" (see above, on 6 ἐργάτις). Fenn. suggests that Pindar excuses himself for not having sent the ode before: "if he had been composing for love, Thrasybulus would have come high on Pindar's list: whereas under existing conditions his commission has had to await its turn for execution". But in that case the poet would have mentioned the fact that the execution was overdue, as he does at the beginning of *O*. 10.

The scholia give us the option between two possibilities: (a) Pindar criticizes Simonides, (b) Pindar asks for a remuneration. Simonides' lust for money was well-known (cf. Callim. fr. 222 Pf. οὐ γὰρ ἐργάτιν τρέφω τὴν Μοῦσαν, ὡς ὁ Κεῖος Ὑλίχου νέπους)[24], and many critics (among whom Dorns., Pu., Wil., 312-3, Gund., 99)[25] think that the words φιλοκερδής

---

[22] See also Nisetich, 155 n. 50.

[23] Cf. also F. Maier, *Der σοφός-Begriff von Homer bis Euripides* (Augsburg 1970), 73 ff.

[24] See further Schmid, 498 n. 3, Maehler, 78 n. 1, J. M. Bell, QUCC 28 (1979), 29 ff.

[25] See further Pavese, 105 n. 5.

and ἐργάτις (cf. Callim. quoted above) are aimed at him[26]. But this leaves the connection between the introduction and the rest of the poem unexplained[27].

Farn. (I, 250) takes the introduction to contain "a delicate hint to Thrasuboulos that Pindar would like to receive a fee" and that this fee "may have been long due to him from Xenokrates or Thrasuboulos for some literary service rendered". This idea has been elaborated by Bowra (126), who suggests that Pindar "wrote an ode of his own volition [for an Isthmian victory gained by Xenocrates], as he may have written *Pythian* 6, and now hopes that he may be rewarded for it". But, as is admitted by Bowra himself, it is strange that the poet should ask money for a service rendered long ago. I therefore prefer to assume that Pindar had written *P.* 6 spontaneously (according to the schol. the official victory ode had been commissioned from Simonides: cf. Farn. I, 248), but that Thrasybulus had ordered another poem for some memorial celebration of his father[28], and that the poet warns him that such a posthumous homage will have to be paid for.

At any rate the conclusion that Pindar is asking for money seems to me inescapable. All attempts to avoid this conclusion have led to strained, and even absurd, interpretations. For instance, Bury suggests that the ode had been ordered by Xenocrates and that he would have paid for it, but that Pindar sends it to Thrasybulus as a gift, because the latter "has lost his wealth" and "can hardly afford the extravagance of an epinician". This presupposes an impossible ellipse: 'I use to write for money, but will not do so in the present case'[29]. Norwood (154-7) concludes from *P.* 6, 49 that Thrasybulus himself was a poet, and that after his political decline he tried to earn money by his poetic talent: "Pindar

---

[26] Priv. argues that "secondo Pindaro il detto dell'Argivo era raccomandata dalla Musa stessa ed era vicinissimo al vero: un'opinione del genere, riferita a Simonide, sarebbe una giustificazione, non un biasimo". But Pindar might be assumed to speak in a sarcastic vein. On the other hand, Priv. (29) suggests that Pindar "canta una vittoria già cantata dal rivale Simonide", which seems to me an arbitrary assumption.

[27] As is observed by Farn. I, 249 and Woodbury, 529. Wil. (312) claims: "in der Tat kommt erst durch diese Absicht Einheit in das Ganze", but does not even try to prove this contention. Bernard (39) maintains: "Pindar bekennt sich zu den alten Dichtern", but the text does not contain any evidence supporting this assumption. E. A. Freeman's interpretation, quoted with approval by Simpson (471 n. 65), "as the Muse was once not mercenary, so now she shall cease to be mercenary" (similarly Me., Fraccaroli, Schmitz, *op. cit.* [above, n. 14], 46), is equally impossible.

[28] It is misleading to call *I.* 2 'a poetic epistle' (Wil., 310, Dorns., Pu., Norwood, 153) or "not an Epinician but a personal poem" (Bowra, 356).

[29] Bury tries to support his assumption by pointing out parallels between *P.* 6 and *I.* 2, but these are not sufficiently specific to prove that both poems have the same character. He further discovers a number of 'signals' in *I.* 2, but these stem from his own imagination.

offers him half-jocular sympathy". Woodbury, who rightly rejects these views, thinks that the purpose of the contrast between old and new poetry "is to demonstrate the increased capabilities and achievements of wealth properly used and so to praise the public use that Thrasybulus has made of his own wealth by commissioning and producing the present ode" (540)[30]. He tries to counter the objection implied in φιλοκερδής in the following way: "If the Muse has a love of profit and has gone into service, that can do no harm, because the end she serves is the highest end, and the profit she seeks, the highest profit, the praise of excellence" (541). The text does not offer the slightest hint of such a restriction, and Woodbury's argument is but a specious piece of rhetoric inspired by Bundyism (see above, n. 15)[31].

Woodbury gets entangled in the problem because he starts from the presupposition that "an obsession with fees is the least likely of themes for a Pindaric proem" (531). He admits that *P.* 11, 41 μισθοῖο συνέθευ παρέχειν φωνὰν ὑπάργυρον hints at a fee, but this is said to be equivalent to "praise of the patron's use of wealth" (542 n. 26). Here again we find Woodbury twisting the evidence. The difficulty disappears when we realize that Pindar was a professional poet, who had to live by his trade. He not only frankly admitted this, but even urged his patrons to be as generous as possible in their remuneration. That this is the intention of his references to a fee (cf. also *P.* 2, 67, *P.* 5, 106, fr. 288) has been convincingly shown by S. Gzella, *The Problem of the Fee in Greek Choral Lyric*, Eos 59 (1971), 189-202. He rightly concludes (195) that the poet "expected that, captivated by the charm of his music and poetry, taken by his compliments and flattery, they would be disposed to be better than their word and to pay a higher fee than he had bargained for", but that he had to be careful not to spoil the elevated mood of his song and so expressed his wishes in an indirect and subtle way: "He encouraged his customer to be liberal with smart compliments, friendly advices [i.e., to use his wealth for the perpetuation of his fame], ingenious metaphors, and amusing jokes"[32].

---

[30] Similarly Pavese, 111: "un indiretto elogio dell'amichevole liberalità del committente", Kurz, *loc. cit.* (above, n. 21): "eine vornehme Huldigung an Thrasybulos, der als Kunstkenner Pindar diesen Auftrag zur Verherrlichung seines verstorbenen Vaters Xenokrates gegeben hat", Priv.: "È la solita lode della *liberalità* del committente". Cf. also Gianotti, 11-5.

[31] Cf. also the critical remarks made by Nisetich, 137-8.

[32] Schmid (498 n. 3) already pointed out that "Pindar ... appelliert deutlich an die Freigebigkeit seiner Gönner". Nisetich (136) argues that "there are no examples of cryptic allusion to this kind of liberality, no indirect praises of it". He thinks (154 n. 42) that the main purpose of *N.* 4, 75 συνθέμενος "is to mark a change of theme, a transition to the specifically epinician part of the ode", but it should be added that *N.* 4, 77-9 πάτραν ἵν' ἀκούομεν, Τιμάσαρχε, τεὰν ἐπινικίοισιν ἀοιδαῖς πρόπολον ἔμμεναι is an indirect appeal to

The proem of *I.* 2 is the most exquisite instance of this *topos*[33]. It may be written in a jocular tone, but I do not believe that it is an expression of self-irony[34]. Pindar certainly was not ashamed of soliciting the generosity of his patrons[35]: he was very conscious of the value of his art (cf. e.g. *O.* 2, 86-8)[36], and his self-advertisement and self-justification are part of his self-consciousness.

---

the victor's liberality. *N.* 7, 17-21 is a similar and equally indirect appeal. Nisetich (137) in his criticism of Pavese rightly observes that in the proem of *I.* 2 "there is no reason for combining money and wisdom as they are combined in the lines from *Nemean* 7", but he has failed to add that σοφός at *I.* 2, 12 does not refer to forethought, as at *N.* 7, 17, but to connoisseurship (see above), and that an expert in poetry is supposed to know that ordering a victory ode means spending money.

Cf. also J. Svenbro, *La parole et le marbre* (Lund 1976), 173 ff., who is wrong, however, in concluding that Pindar's commercial attitude is incompatible with real friendship between the poet and his client (see further below). Cf. Gund, 36: "Er setzt jedoch die freie Charis, die er dem Agathos an und für sich schuldet, nicht einfach allgemein in Gegensatz zu einer geschäftsmässigen Verpflichtung ... er gibt eine besondere Gabe, um die er gebeten und für die er durch Bewirtung und Gegengabe entlohnt wird, in freier gegenseitiger Euergesia".

Hubbard (161) rightly observes that "Pindar refers quite openly to the monetary basis of his vocation", but his conclusion that "the whole χρέος-motif ... surely has its basis in this contractual relationship between subject and object" is misleading: we have seen above (on *O.* 1, 103 χρή) that the motif of debt is closely connected with that of friendship. Hubbard (162) rightly adds that "the opening reflections on the mercantile basis of poetry merely [?] form part of the broader praise of *xenia* prominent throughout the rest of the poem", but he confuses the issue by writing that "money is, in fact, the means of winning friends": its transfer is rather, as Hubbard himself concludes, "a visible token of mutual recognition and trust".

[33] Although the subtlety does not go as far as is assumed by Pavese (110): he thinks that 11 φίλων implies a warning addressed to Thrasybulus: "Let not false economy deprive you of your friend Pindar and of his help in immortalizing your fame". Accordingly, he translates σοφός by 'accorto' and compares *N.* 7, 17-8, but there the word means 'skilled' rather than 'clever' (see further above, n. 32).

[34] As is assumed e.g. by Maehler, 88, Kurz, *loc. cit.* (above, n. 21), Nisetich, 141 and 150.

[35] As is suggested by J. A. Davison, *From Archilochos to Pindar* (London 1968), 305: "Pindar had to follow the example of Simonides, but he only did so under protest, as we see from the beginning of Isth. II". Similarly Maehler, 88: "Im Grunde aber hat er es als peinlich empfunden, für Geld dichten zu müssen".

[36] Cf. also my notes on *O.* 7, 8 καρπὸν φρενός and 11 Χάρις, and see further A. Croiset, *La poésie de Pindare* (Paris [3]1895), 274-8, Maehler, 98, M. Durante, in R. Schmitt, *Indogermanische Dichtersprache* (Darmstadt 1968), 283 ff., S. Gzella, *Self-publicity and Polemics in Greek Choral Lyrics*, Eos 58 (1969-70), 171-9, P. Angeli Bernardini, *L''aquila tebana' vole ancora*, QUCC 26 (1977), 121-6. The view expressed by W. J. Slater, CJ 72 (1977), 198, "Personal claims for the power of poetry ... represent an attempt to advertise poetry in the face of potential skeptics", is one-sided and therefore misleading. Nis.'s comment (43), "Even his frequent claim to poetic supremacy, for all its apparent egoism, enhances the victor's prestige, for it implies that the victor, in choosing Pindar to celebrate his deeds, shows a certain good taste and understanding", is equally misleading. For Nisetich's adherence to Bundyism see above, n. 15.

It has often been objected that self-preoccupation does not suit the context of a victory ode[37]. It is true that Pindar calls his songs ξυνός and κοινός (*O.* 7, 21, *O.* 10, 11, *I.* 6, 65, etc.)[38], but this does not prevent him from incorporating reflections on his personal situation[39]. He could do so without scruples because he used to consider himself a friend of his patron (see below, on 48 ξεῖνον), and κοινὰ τὰ τῶν φίλων (E. *Or.* 735, Pl. *Phdr.* 279 c 6), in other words: Pindar did not draw a sharp distinction between his own interests and those of his clients.

12: οὐκ ἄγνωτα. For the litotes see note on *O.* 11, 18 μηδ' ἀπείρατον. The plural ἄγνωτα is better than ἀγνῶτα, for the adjective certainly also refers to the other two victories. Pavese (111) takes οὐκ ἀγνῶτα to have resultative force, but it would be arrogant to suggest that such a brief mention suffices to make a victory famous. Schr. assumes ἄγνωτα to have adverbial force ("non obscure tibi"), but it is more natural to take it as a predicate: 'the victories which I am singing are well-known'. In that case 18 is "a mild anacoluthon" (Bury). For the emphatic position of the predicate cf. my note on *O.* 3, 19 ὅλον.

Kurz, *loc. cit.* (above, n. 21), takes the asyndeton to have explanatory force, referring to σοφός: "der Satz ἔσσι γὰρ ὢν σοφός (12) hat so Beziehung nach beiden Seiten: er spricht aus, dass Thrasybulus die Situation des Dichters und die Qualität seines Liedes richtig einschätzen wird". In that case we have to read ἀγνῶτι or adopt Schr.'s explanation, "non obscure tibi pro tua sapientia"[40], but οὐκ ἄγνωτος or οὐκ ἀγνώς without a genitive of object (as at 30-2) would hardly be an explanation of σοφός. The phrase more probably refers to the fact that the victories mentioned by Pindar were gained long ago and had already got their proper songs of praise. Accordingly, the asyndeton explains the special character of the commission, the request of a song commemorating a number of past victories, a commission which will have to be answered by an equally special remuneration[41].

---

[37] Cf. e.g. Gianotti, 13-4: "gli epinici pindarici ... sono composti in vista di una rappresentazione pubblica: non vi possono trovare posto, convenzionalmente, problemi o richieste personali del poeta".

[38] Nisetich (141-2) assumes an "ironical suppression" of this theme in the proem, indicated by 12 οὐκ ἄγνωτα and by the predominance of the idea of fame in the second triad. Accordingly, he takes σοφός to refer to Thrasybulus' ability to discern the superior value of epinician as compared with erotic poetry. This seems to me an artificial construction: the assumption of irony enables the interpreter to prove almost anything he wants.

[39] For personal elements in his poetry cf. Schmid, 605.

[40] Cf. Latt. 'you know whereof I sing'.

[41] Bury's explanation, "you are wise and can penetrate my meaning; therefore I go on to your father's Isthmian victory", can hardly be correct. I cannot accept either Nisetich's interpretation (142), who takes οὐκ ἄγνωτα to "stress the fact that the victory is famous and is so because of epinian poetry" and thinks that "the change in direction" from erotic to epinician poetry "is dramatically indicated by the asyndeton".

13: Ἰσθμίαν ... νίκαν. Referred to at *O.* 2, 50 and so to be dated before 476. Me. plausibly suggests "dass mit dem isthmischen Sieg begonnen wird, weil speciell zur Erinnerung an ihn, der vermuthlich der letzte des Xenokrates war, das gegenwärtige Fest gefeiert wurde; daran reiht sich sein pythischer als sein grösster Erfolg, und daran erst schliesst sich der panathenäische, weil dieser den besten Uebergang zu dem olympischen des Theron bot, da die beiden letztgenannten von demselben Wagenlenker errungen wurden".

13: ἵπποισι. For the instrumental dative cf. *P.* 6, 17 ἅρματι νίκαν, *I.* 3, 16 δόξαν παλαιὰν ἅρμασιν, K.G. I, 428, Schw. II, 166.

14: ὀπάσαις. Cf. Hom. Θ 141 Ζεὺς κῦδος ὀπάζει, LSJ II.

15: Δωρίων. Cf. *N.* 4, 88 Κορινθίοις σελίνοις, *I.* 8, 63-4 Ἴσθμιον ἂν νάπος Δωρίων ἔλαχεν σελίνων. I doubt whether Thu. is right in suggesting that " 'dorisch' bezeichnet nicht nur die Herkunft, sondern auch den besonderen Wert einer Sache". The parallels which he quotes have a political context.

15: αὐτῷ. Has been added for the sake of clarity: it prevents us from connecting κόμᾳ with πέμπεν. Cf. K.G. I, 660-1, W. F. Bakker, *Pronomen abundans and pronomen coniunctum*, Verh. Kon. Ned. Akad. v. Wet., afd. Lett. N.R. 82 (1974), espec. 14-5. Bury wrongly concludes that "αὐτῷ expresses that Poseidon's intention was that Xenocrates should himself wear the crown: πέμπεν expresses that the intention was not carried out" (similarly Farn.).

16: πέμπεν. The imperfect is used instead of the aorist when the action is viewed as a "process in its perspective": cf. W. F. Bakker, *The Greek Imperative* (Amsterdam 1966), 27. For parallels cf. K.G. I, 144, Chantraine, *Gramm. hom.* II, 193-4, Schw. II, 276. Simpson (472) rightly observes that "the ode is dominated by the past tense and seems almost a reminiscence", but this is to be explained from the fact that it is destined for a memorial celebration and does not imply "a preference...for a past now lost".

16: ἀναδεῖσθαι. 'To have himself crowned': see note on *N.* 11, 28 ἀνδησάμενος.

16: σελίνων. Wild celery rather than parsley: cf. *KP* II, 335 s.v. Eppich. This plant was sacred to the gods of the underworld, and the schol. may be right in referring to the fact that the Isthmia were originally funeral games in honour of Melicertes[42].

17: εὐάρματον. *P.* 4, 7 of a town 'having good chariots', but of a victor (similarly *O.* 2, 17, *P.* 2, 5) more probably 'successful with his chariot'[43]:

---

[42] See further O. Broneer, *The Isthmian Victory Crown*, AJA 66 (1962), 259-63, espec. 263 n. 36.

[43] We.'s 'des siegreichen Rennwagens Herrn' seems to me unparalleled.

see my note on *O.* 1, 73 Εὐτρίαιναν. For sentences carried over from one triad to another cf. Bowra, 319.

17: φάος. Thu. rightly observes that this means not only 'most prominent person' but also 'bringer of welfare and salvation': cf. *O.* 5, 14, *P.* 3, 75, LSJ II 1, Fraenkel on A. *Ag.* 522, and see my notes on *O.* 1, 23 λάμπει and *O.* 10, 23 φάος[44].

18: ἐν Κρίσᾳ. A place in the neighbourhood of Delphi. Accordingly, ἐν means 'near', properly 'in the region of': cf. *P.* 1, 32 ἐν δρόμῳ, *P.* 8, 39-40 ἐν ἑπταπύλοις Θήβαις, *N.* 10, 8 ἐν Θήβαις, Thuc. I 57, 1 τὴν ἐν Κερκύρᾳ ναυμαχίαν, Isocr. 5, 147 ἡ ἐν Σαλαμῖνι μάχη. This victory is the subject of *P.* 6.

18: εἶδε. Has the pregnant sense of εὐμενῶς ἐθεάσατο (schol.): see my note on *O.* 14, 16 ἰδοῖσα.

18: τε. Has consecutive force: cf. K.G. II, 242-3. Similarly 25.

18: ἀγλαΐαν. 'A splendid victory': cf. *O.* 9, 106, *O.* 13, 14, *P.* 10, 28, and see my note on *O.* 14, 7 ἀγλαός[45]. For the *abstractum pro concreto* see note on *O.* 10, 72 συμμαχία. The phrase πόρε τ' ἀγλαΐαν is not translated by Nis.: see above, nn. 3 and 11.

19: καὶ τόθι. Not translated by Nis. The phrase can hardly refer forward to ἐν Ἀθάναις (as is assumed by Fenn., Dorns., Thu.). Taking τόθι in a relative sense (called "nicht sinnlos" by Thu.) results in a very tortuous construction. Moreover the fact that Apollo is connected with the Charites is an insufficient base for the assumption that the Athenian victory was due to Apollo. Pu. adopts Heyne's reading καὶ τόθι· κλειναῖς δέ, but the implication that all of Xenocrates' victories were due to Apollo is obviously absurd. The best solution seems to be to insert τε after κλειναῖς (Bury, Tur., We., Sn.M.), if we drop the idea that Thrasybulus was the charioteer in the Pythian games: cf. schol. *P.* 6, 15 Θρασύβουλε· τοῦτον δὲ ὡς φιλοπάτορα καὶ προεστῶτα τῆς ἱππικῆς ἐπαινεῖ, οὐχ ὥς τινες ἐβουλήθησαν, ἡνίοχον· ὁ γὰρ ἡνίοχος Νικόμαχός ἐστιν, ὡς ἐκ τῶν Ἰσθμιονίκων δῆλός ἐστιν. Thu. objects that Nicomachus does not occur in *P.* 6, but Pindar does not always mention the name of the charioteer. Priv. thinks

---

[44] C. J. Ruijgh (private letter) suggests that there may be a pun in σελίνων - (σέλας) - φάος. He compares Hom. Σ 214 ἀπ' Ἀχιλλῆος κεφαλῆς σέλας αἰθέρ' ἵκανε, but that is an exceptional situation. Elsewhere in Homer a hero's splendour issues from his weapons (cf. T. Krischer, *Formale Konventionen der Homerischen Epik*, Munich 1971, 36-8), and these are not relevant to the context of our passage.

[45] Cf. also D. Bremer, *Licht und Dunkel in der frühgriechischen Dichtung* (Bonn 1976), 249-51.

C. J. Ruijgh (private letter) suggests that Pindar perhaps alludes to the interpretation of vision as based on rays of light issuing from the eyes (cf. my observations in *Studia C. W. Vollgraff*, Amsterdam 1948, 161 ff.), but I do not know of cases in which an object seen is considered to be illuminated by the visual rays.

that the space of time between *P.* 6 (490) and *I.* 2 is too great, but I do not see why the same charioteer could not have functioned during 15 (Priv.) or even 20 years. Priv. further objects that καὶ...τε is not found in poetry, and refers to Denn., 535. But καί and τε are not corresponsive: we should put a comma after ἀγλαΐαν and take καί to introduce a specification: cf. Men. *Epitr.* 750, and see my note on *Epitr.* 161, Mnem. IV 27 (1974), 161, and the references given there. In that case τε simply marks a supplementary addition: cf. K.G. II, 251, Denn., 499. Similarly *N.* 7, 65. Priv. reads καὶ τότε (D^1), but his reference to Dem. 24, 48 does not prove that τότε can have the meaning of 'subsequently'[46].

19: κλειναῖς. Fenn. observes that this may mean 'renowned' or 'making renowned', but that the former is preferable because in fr. 76 Athens is called κλειναί. But just as in 2 κλυτᾷ both meanings may be intended (We. 'von Erechtheus' Stamm aufs rühmlichste anerkannt')[47].

19: Ἐρεχθειδᾶν. The Athenians: cf. *P.* 7, 10 Ἐρεχθέος ἀστῶν.

19: χαρίτεσσιν. 'Favours', 'homage' (Me. 'Siegesehren'): cf. *P.* 1, 76 ἀρέομαι ... Ἀθαναίων χάριν μισθόν. This is more natural than Farn.'s explanation, delightful things (similarly LSJ A IV) made by the Athenians, i.e. prizes. The alternative suggested by Farn., 'dear to the Charites of Athens' (similarly Thu.), is improbable, for it is insufficiently paralleled by S. *El.* 147 ἐμέ γ' ἁ στονόεσσ' ἄραρεν φρένας (quoted by Farn.) and Hom. δ 777 ἐνὶ φρεσὶν ἤραρεν ἡμῖν, and *N.* 5, 44 ἁ Νεμέα ἄραρεν (quoted by Farn. and Thu.) means 'was favourably disposed towards' (similarly *O.* 6, 76), not 'found favour with'[48]. Bury's translation 'gracious victories' (similarly Slater 1 a, Gianotti, 75 'splendore e gloria') does not suit the genitive Ἐρεχθειδᾶν.

19: ἀραρώς. 'Joined to', hence 'provided with': see note on *O.* 10, 83 ἀραρότα.

20: λιπαραῖς. Similarly *N.* 4, 18, fr. 76. The epithet became popular: cf. e.g. E. *Alc.* 452, *Tro.* 803, *I.T.* 1130, Ar. *Ach.* 639, *Eq.* 1329, *Nub.* 299. When it is used of Orchomenus (*O.* 14, 3; cf. Hom. I 381) and Egypt (fr. 82) it may refer to the fertile soil (cf. Friis Johansen-Whittle on A. *Suppl.* 1028), but in the case of Athens 'shining', 'splendid' (cf. Hom. ν 388 Τροίης λιπαρὰ κρήδεμνα) seems to be more likely, not only because the soil of Attica was not particularly fertile[49], but also in view

[46] The emendation καί ποτε (Schr., Farn.) gives a weak sense.

[47] Priv. takes the word to belong to Χαρίτεσσιν, but 'Cariti illustri degli Eretteidi' sounds awkward.

[48] Priv. translates 'stretto alle Cariti': he compares Hom. N 800 Τρῶες ... ἀρηρότες (scil. ἀλλήλοις), but such a military image is too drastic for the context.

[49] As is rightly observed by van Leeuwen on Ar. *Nub.* 300. He is wrong, however, in suggesting that Pindar adapted the word from the shining clothes of the citizens to the town as a whole.

of Pindar's tendency to interpret superiority in terms of light (see above, on 17 φάος). This also better explains the fact that in fr. 76 λιπαραί opens the list of Athens' epithets.

20: οὐκ ἐμέμφθη. 'He did not have cause to complain'. For the litotes see above, on 12 οὐκ ἄγνωτα.

21: ῥυσίδιφρον. Translations such as 'who looked after his chariot' (Bo.) and 'of his driver' (Nis.) are too weak. The meaning is 'who preserved his chariot' (cf. A. *Sept.* 130 ῥυσίπτολις, *Eum.* 920 ῥυσίβωμος), scil. by avoiding collisions: cf. *P.* 5, 32 ἀκηράτοις ἀνίαις, 50-1 ὅλον δίφρον κομίξαις.

21: φωτός. See above, on 1 φῶτες.

21: κατὰ καιρόν. Not 'at the right moment' (the common translation), but 'in proper measure': cf. Priv. 'con giusta misura', who refers to Barrett's note on E. *Hipp.* 386. See further J. R. Wilson, *Καιρός as 'Due Measure'*, Glotta 58 (1980), 177-204, espec. 186, who compares fr. 123, 1 and 127, 2. For καιρός as a principle of Pindar's thought cf. Gund., 66 ff., M. Riemschneider-Hörner, *Die Raumanschauung bei Pindar*, Ztschr. f. Ästhet. u. allg. Kunstw. 36 (1942), 96-114., espec. 105-9, M. Lefkowitz, HSCP 67 (1962), 206-8, P. Angeli Bernardini, QUCC 4 (1967). 84-7. It seems to me rather artificial to interpret καιρός in the present passage as ''what mediates the near and the far'', as is done by Hubbard (22 n. 33).

22: νεῖμε. Not 'gave his horses the reins' (the common interpretation), but 'plied his hands on the reins' (Farn.)[50]: cf. *N.* 6, 15 ἴχνεσι πόδα νέμων, A. *Ag.* 802 οἴακα νέμων[51].

23: καί. Not 'the Elean heralds, too', for this would imply that the Athenian heralds had recognized him before (this assumption seems to have misled the schol. who states that Nicomachus was an Athenian). For καί 'also' referring to a whole sentence or clause see note on *O.* 1, 28 καὶ (βροτῶν).

23: κάρυκες. Who travelled around to announce the next games.

23: ὡρᾶν. Not 'seasons' (for the season of the games did not vary), but 'right times' (LSJ B I).

23: ἀνέγνων. Rightly kept by Bury: cf. *P.* 9, 79 ἔγνων. The emendation ἀνέγνον is unnecessary (at *P.* 4, 120 ἔγνον is due to metrical compulsion): for epic forms in Pindar cf. Wil., 101 ff., Schmid, 610 and n. 3, Forssman, 86 ff. Pu.'s translation 'ont honoré' (cf. Latt. 'acclaimed') is

---

[50] Similarly Latt. 'handling all reins', Thu. (who fails, however, to give a clear explanation), Priv.

[51] Norwood (156) compares 38-9 νομίζων ... νόμῳ, 47 ἀπόνειμον, and concludes that νόμος in the sense of 'coin' (LSJ III) is the central symbol of the ode (cf. 8 ἀργυρωθεῖσαι). It hardly needs saying that this is sheer fantasy.

wrong, 'knew' (Bo., Conw., Nis.) is misleading: they recognized him (LSJ I 2).

23: σπονδοφόροι. Not 'who keep the truce' (Bo.), but 'who announce the truce' (cf. Thuc. V 49, 1-2). For φέρω 'to bring a message' cf. LSJ A IV 4.

24: Ζηνός. Bury's translation 'bearers of the truce of Zeus' (similarly Farn., Bo., Nis.) is misleading, for they obviously act as heralds of Zeus.

24: πού τι. Fenn. rightly observes that τι is to be connected with που (see note on *O.* 1, 28 που), but is wrong in thinking that the particles as such express uncertainty and that "the appeal to the audience makes them virtually give emphasis". The particles as such express indefiniteness, and it depends on the context whether certainty or reserve predominates. In the present case, just as at *O.* 1, 28, the former is the case, so that we should translate 'no doubt', not 'vielleicht' (Thu.)[52].

25: ἀδυπνόῳ. *O.* 13, 22 said of the Muse. Although πνοά is used of wind-instruments (*N.* 3, 79, LSJ IV), it does not refer to sound as such. Therefore, such translations as 'mit freudiger Stimme Hauch' (We.) or 'with glad outcry' (Latt.; similarly Nis.) are wrong, and 'breathing sweetness, delighted to hear' (Slater; similarly Priv. 'con voce (per lui) dolcissima') is misleading. The context of *O.* 6, 82-3 shows that πνοαῖς refers to the mind, not to the voice. Accordingly, ἀδύπνοος means 'pleasantly (i.e. kindly) disposed' (Pu. 'leur voix bienveillante'). For 'spirit' conceived as a form of breath cf. A. *Suppl.* 29 αἰδοίῳ πνεύματι χώρας, LSJ I 2, A. *Ag.* 1206 ἐμοὶ πνέων χάριν, LSJ V, Onians, 52-6.

25: τε. Has consecutive force: see above, on 18.

26: χρυσέας. Thu. writes: "χρυσέας weist auf den hohen Wert des Sieges hin", but gold symbolizes both value and radiance, so that the adjective may be translated by 'splendid': see my notes on *O.* 3, 42 αἰδοιέστατος and *O.* 11, 13 χρυσέας. A third aspect is its imperishableness, which, together with the two other aspects, explains the fact that it characterizes the possessions of the gods (see my note on *O.* 3, 19 χρυσάρματος) and parts of the gods themselves (cf. *O.* 7, 32 χρυσοκόμας). Homer speaks of χρυσέη Ἀφροδίτη (Χ 470, θ 337), which refers to her radiant beauty and perhaps to her jewellery[53]. When Pindar uses it of the Muses (*I.* 8, 5a) and other goddesses (*O.* 13, 8, *N.* 5, 7), he re-interprets the Homeric epithet: see my notes on *O.* 3, 24 ὀξείαις. In its application to Nike the word probably suggests that a victory in the games makes a man immortal: see note on *O.* 11, 13 χρυσέας (ἐλαίας).

---

[52] Priv. seems to me equally wrong in writing that "πού τι sottolinea l'indeterminatezza dell'azione ospitale".

[53] As is argued by J. van Eck, *The Homeric Hymn to Aphrodite* (Diss. Utrecht 1978), 40.

26: ἐν γούνασιν πίτνοντα. The meaning of this image is less clear than that of *N.* 5, 42 Νίκας ἐν ἀγκώνεσσι πίτνων (cf. also *N.* 8, 3). Schol. 34a thinks of a prayer (cf. γόνασί τινος προσπίπτειν, ἐς γούνατά τινι πίπτειν): similarly Bo. 'when he fell at the knees of golden victory'. But (1) in that case ἐν is difficult to explain, and (2) a prayer after a victory is improbable. Pindar combined the image of the phrase θεῶν ἐν γούνασι κεῖται (Hom. P 514, α 267, etc.) with that of falling dice (εὖ πίπτειν, etc.: LSJ V 2). For mixing of metaphors in Pindar cf. *I.* 7, 19 ἐπέων ῥοαῖσι ζυγέν, Dorns., *P. S.*, 66 ff., Bowra, 269 ff. For the knees of the gods as a symbol of predestination cf. Onians, 303-9.

26: Νίκας. Pindar probably alludes to the name Νικόμαχος: cf. Barkhuizen, 56-8, who compares *O.* 10, 72-9 Νικεύς ... νίκας, *N.* 5, 42-53 Νίκας ... νικῶντα, *I.* 5, 54-5 καλλίνικον ... Κλεονίκου, *I.* 8, 68-71 ἐνίκασε ... Νικοκλέος.

27: ἀνά. 'Somewhere in': cf. *I.* 8, 63 Ἴσθμιον ἂν νάπος, Bury, Appendix H.

27: Ὀλυμπίου. 'Of Olympia': see note on *O.* 10, 101 Ὀλύμπιον.

27: καλέοισιν. Probably suggests a connection between Ἀλεῖοι (24) and ἄλσος: see note on *O.* 10, 45 Ἄλτιν. I therefore doubt whether Bury is right in taking the subject of καλέοισιν to be 'men' rather than the Eleans. Wil. (312) wrongly calls this clause a "Füllsel, das die rasche Abfassung des Briefes entschuldigen muss". Thu. is equally wrong in writing: "Diese langatmige Umschreibung des Kampfortes Olympia dient dem Lobe dieser Stätte".

28: ἄλσος. A whole country or town could be imagined to be the precinct of a god: see my note on *O.* 3, 18 ἄλσει.

28: ἀθανάτοις. Thu. remarks: "Der Ausdruck 'unsterbliche Ehren' ist hier besonders sinnvoll, da Theron und Xenokrates bereits tot sind. 'Unsterblich' sind die Ehren durch das Siegeslied geworden (vgl. fr. 121, 4: θνᾴσκει δὲ σιγαθὲν καλὸν ἔργον). Dass Pindar die Ehren des Lobliedes im Auge hat, zeigen die folgenden Verse, die von früheren Preisliedern sprechen". It should be added that the victory as such may be called ἀθάνατος, because it makes the victor immortal: see my notes on *O.* 7, 11 ζωθάλμιος, *O.* 10, 95 τρέφοντι, *N.* 11, 17 δέ. For the causative aspect of the adjective see above, on 2 κλυτᾶ̣ and 19 κλειναῖς. Similarly A. *Cho.* 619 ἀθανάτας τριχός.

28-9: Αἰνησιδάμου παῖδες. "A purposely vague statement, as only Theron won at Olympia" (Fenn.). Thu. compares *I.* 5, 17-9. The phrase also "enables Pindar to include Thrasyboulos, who is not a victor in the standard epinician praise of wise generosity" (Nis.; cf. his article on *I.* 2, 143-4).

29: ἔμιχθεν. P. W. Rose, HSCP 78 (1974), 168, thinks that "Pindar

is very fond of a metaphoric association of athletic victory with sexual union or marriage"[54]. But the metaphor is as old as Hom. υ 203 (ἄνδρας) μισγέμεναι κακότητι καὶ ἄλγεσι and as neutral as 'to mix in politics', 'to be mixed up in': see note on *O.* 1, 22 προσέμειξε.

30: καὶ γάρ. Does not have explanatory force (as is assumed by Me., Fenn., Bury, Farn., Slater, Nisetich, 144 and 155 n. 55), for a general statement can hardly motivate one (or even three) special victory(ies). Thu. and Priv. rightly take καὶ γάρ in an affirmative sense[55]. In that case the asyndeton has consecutive force, and here introduces a (generalizing) conclusion: see my notes on *O.* 1, 114 μηκέτι and *O.* 3, 45 οὐ.

For καὶ γάρ 'truly', 'indeed' cf. Denn., 108-9, who does not offer, however, a clear explanation. J. C. B. Low, Glotta 51 (1973), 39, rightly remarks: "It is impossible to derive all the uses of γάρ from the causal". He refers to τοιγάρ and concludes (39-40): "It seems likely that in some at least of its 'simple' uses (*G.P.* 100 ff., especially 105-108) we should recognize survivals of uses of ἄρα, as perhaps in some other uses of γάρ, particularly in questions (cf. *G.P.* 85)". Ruijgh (719-20) argues that γάρ originally was a combination of γε and ἄρα, but that "au niveau synchronique du langage homérique, γάρ sert simplement de coordinant causal ('car')", so that even in εἰ γάρ (equivalent to εἴθε) γάρ must have causal force. But in such cases as Hom. Α 232, 293 ἦ γάρ seems to be hardly different from ἦ ἄρα, and I do not see why the original force of γε + ἄρα should not be assumed to persist, if it saves us from strained explanations.

30: οὐκ ἀγνῶτες. For the litotes see above, on 12 οὐκ ἄγνωτα. For the active sense cf. *P.* 9, 58, K.G. I, 370. The echo between οὐκ ἀγνῶτες and 12 οὐκ ἄγνωτα enables Pindar to add, almost imperceptibly (32 οὔτε), a new aspect to the theme of fame, viz. the idea that fame is made permanent (cf. 28 ἀθανάτοις) by poetry[56].

---

[54] He refers to Th. Hoey, HSCP 70 (1965), 237-42, who argues that the things with which persons or things are 'mixed' "are weighted with symbolism which ... renders them ethereal and lifts them to a higher plane" (237), and concludes (242) that "these Pindaric comminglings" look "as if they too—like the earlier sexual comminglings with divinity—proceeded from the force of Love", so that "man is subordinated to the leaves of victory or to abstract splendor, and by the same token he is subordinated and united to divinity". There is not the slightest evidence for such a hypothesis. Hoey thinks (239) that at Hom. Γ 55 ὅτ' ἐν κονίῃσι μιγείης "dust becomes not just a staining adjunct but an enveloping fold", and he even speaks of "the enveloping dative case" (241), but the verb implies only an intensive contact. Hoey (238) also quotes the epic formula ἐμίγην φιλότητι καὶ εὐνῇ, apparently without realizing that the datives there have modal force (cf. Β 232, Ω 130 ἐν φιλότητι, and Ο 32-3 εὐνῇ, ἣν ἐμίγης).

[55] But Thu. is wrong in translating 'denn fürwahr'; similarly Slater, 103 (α) 'for the fact is'. Pu.'s 'Ah' may be intended to have affirmative force.

[56] Cf. Nisetich, 144-5, who seems to me wrong, however, in speaking of "a fundamental process' that "reaches its culmination", and in taking οὐκ ἀγνῶτες to imply "the

30: **δόμοι.** The plural has amplifying force: see my note on *O.* 3, 6 στέφανοι.

31: **κώμων.** 'Revelry' (Bo.; similarly Conw., Nis.) and 'feste' (Priv.) are misleading translations, for the preceding sentence shows that festive processions are meant, and these are a religious ceremony: see my note on *O.* 3, 6 ἀγλαόκωμον.

31: **ἐρατῶν.** Omitted by Nis.: see above, n. 3. The translation 'lovely' (Farn. *et al.*) is misleading, for the meaning is 'desired' (see note on *O.* 10, 99 ἐρατόν), hence 'delightful', 'glorious': similarly *O.* 6, 43 ὠδίνεσσ' ἐραταῖς, *N.* 6, 12 ἐρατῶν ἀέθλων, fr. 124, 1 ἐρατᾶν ὄχημ' ἀοιδᾶν.

32: **μελικόμπων.** See above, on 3 μελιγάρυας. For κόμπος used in the favourable sense of 'loud praise' cf. *N.* 8, 48, *I.* 1, 43, *I.* 5, 24. Although the word carries 'auditory display' (see note on *O.* 1, 3 γαρύεν), such translations as 'honigprunkend' (Dorns.) and 'honey boast of song' (Nis.) go too far.

33: **οὐ ... πάγος.** For the litotes see above, on 12 οὐκ ἄγνωτα. For the image 'rocky hill' = difficulty cf. Hes. *Op.* 290-2 ὄρθιος οἶμος ἐς αὐτὴν (success) / καὶ τρηχὺς τὸ πρῶτον· ἐπὴν δ' εἰς ἄκρον ἵκηται, / ῥηιδίη δὴ ἔπειτα πέλει. Nis.'s 'we find no obstacle in the way' is too flat. For the *topos* 'it is easy to compose a song celebrating a conspicuous achievement' cf. *N.* 5, 20, *N.* 7, 77, *N.* 8, 46, Maehler, 92, Thu. on *I.* 1, 45. I do not see that "the γάρ-clause naturally suggests that Thrasyboulos is still being praised for his openness to song" (Nis., 145), nor that "Thrasyboulos' receptivity to the song for Xenocrates is a particular instance of the general hospitality for which Xenocrates is praised beginning at line 35" (146).

33: **προσάντης ἁ κέλευθος.** Cf. *N.* 6, 45 πλατεῖαι ... πρόσοδοι, *I.* 3, 19 μυρία παντᾷ κέλευθος, Becker, 74-6.

33: **γίνεται.** 'Turns out to be'. For this resultative use of γίγνομαι cf. *P.* 3, 12, *P.* 4, 274, *P.* 10, 22, my note on Semon. 7, 36, Mnem. IV 21 (1968), 36, and Verdenius-Waszink on Arist. *GC* 317 a 27[57].

34: **τις.** A poet. Bury connects the word with Ἑλικωνιάδων and takes κέλευθος to mean the road to immortality, but in that case the reference of 33 γάρ becomes obscure.

34: **ἀνδρῶν.** Scil. οἴκους: cf. K.G. I, 268-9. The idea that the poet himself delivers his work is a *topos*, and in most cases a fiction: cf. *O.* 6,

---

patron's understanding". Thu. compares *O.* 6, 96-7 ἀδύλογοι δέ νιν λύραι μολπαί τε γινώσκοντι, but that phrase belongs to the *topos* of musicality as an object of praise (see above, on 12 σοφός), whereas in the present passage that *topos* is used to carry the argument a step forward.

[57] T. E. Wick, AC 44 (1975), 177, wrongly thinks that γίγνομαι can have the meaning of 'to be'.

24-5, *O.* 7, 13, *O.* 14, 18, *P.* 2, 3-4, *I.* 5, 21-2. See further Thu. *ad loc.* and my note on *O.* 1, 111 ἐλθών.

34: ἄγοι. Becker (75 and n. 66) may be right in translating 'fährt'. In that case the image of the chariot of the Muses (2) is taken up, as is suggested by Bernard, 39. For εἰ with optative 'suppose...', but practically equivalent to εἰ with indicative see note on *O.* 11, 4 πράσσοι.

34: Ἑλικωνιάδων. First used by Hesiod (*Th.* 1), but the cult of the Muses on Helicon already existed before his time[58]. For the *genitivus auctoris* ('given by') see my note on *O.* 3, 4 ἄωτον.

35: δισκήσαις. For imagery belonging to the sphere of the games cf. Dorns., *P.S.*, 58, and Thu. *ad loc.* Farn. thinks that δισκήσαις refers to a former ode, but this would make sense only if a special ode (such as *P.* 6) were hinted at. Fenn. *et al.* take δισκήσαις to have the general sense of 'hurling' (cf. E. *Tro.* 1121, *Ion* 1268), but (1) in that case μακρά becomes redundant, and (2) a general use of δισκήσαις close to a specific use of ἀκοντίσσαιμι seems improbable. The most natural explanation seems to me that the participle refers to the mention of Xenocrates' and Theron's victories in the present ode, whereas ἀκοντίσσαιμι refers forward to the description of Xenocrates' character. Thu. objects that in the parallel passages *O.* 13, 93-5, *P.* 1, 42-5, *N.* 9, 53-5 the action expressed by the participle coincides with that of the main verb, but that does not imply that this must always be so[59].

Priv. suggests that "la metafora del canto di lode come giavellotto ... ripropone ciclicamente l'analoga immagine iniziale del canto di lode come freccia", but the functions of the two images are so different ('hitting the mark' and 'surpassing others') that they can hardly constitute a 'cycle', and certainly do not warrant the conclusion that "la simmetria avvalora la supposizione che i canti per i bei ragazzi siano sineddoche per gli encomi in generale" (see above, n. 7). It is true that "the spear-cast must stay within the lateral boundaries on each side of the field" (Hubbard, 31 n. 57, who refers to *P.* 1, 44-5; his references to *O.* 13, 94 and *N.* 9, 55 are irrelevant: see note on *O.* 10, 71 σκοπόν), but this kind of accuracy is different from hitting the mark.

35: ὅσον. For the parallelism between the greatness of the victor and the greatness of the victory ode cf. Fränkel, 523 and n. 33. The idea is spoiled in Latt.'s translation 'I have spun the discus far and thus far also would cast the spear, to tell how...'.

---

[58] Cf. B. A. van Groningen, *Les trois Muses de l'Hélicon*, AC 17 (1948), 287-98; Von der Mühll, *op. cit.* (above, n. 1), 249-52.

[59] If the above interpretation is accepted, Norwood (155) is wrong in calling the sentence "a hopelessly jumbled phrase ... a smiling parody of his own manner". Th. Hoey's suggestion of 'exuberance', HSCP 70 (1965), 248-9, is equally unacceptable.

35: **ὀργάν.** 'Temper', 'mental disposition'. It differs from φύσις in emphasizing the dynamic and emotional aspects of a character, from θυμός in being the source of intentions rather than of impulses. See further Kittel's *Wb.z.N.T.* V, 383.

36: **ὑπὲρ ἀνθρώπων.** Cf. ἀνθρώπων or ἐν ἀνθρώποις with a superlative (LSJ I 3 b). For the use of ὑπέρ 'above' with genitive instead of accusative (LSJ B II 1 a) cf. *N.* 9, 54, fr. 61, 2. In the present case (and perhaps at *N.* 9, 54) the construction is influenced by the idea of 'beyond' implied in ἀκοντίσσαιμι τοσοῦτο.

36: **γλυκεῖαν.** At *P.* 6, 52 Thrasybulus is said to have a γλυκεῖα φρήν. Thu. argues that this does not mean 'kind', but 'beglückend' and 'glücklich'. It is more correct to say that a 'sweet' person is a pleasant person: cf. Sol. 1 D. = 13 W., 5 εἶναι δὲ γλυκὺν ὧδε φίλοις, ἐχθροῖσι δὲ πικρόν, LSJ I 2.

37: **ἔσχεν.** Not 'won by practice' (Bury), but 'obtained' (from fate or from the gods): cf. e.g. *O.* 7, 26 τυχεῖν. Thu. refers to 16 πέμπεν and 41 ἐπέρα, and wrongly concludes that "Pindar scheidet nicht scharf zwischen den Funktionen des Aorists und des Imperfekts": see above, on 16 πέμπεν.

37: **αἰδοῖος.** The asyndeton has explanatory (specifying) force: cf. K.G. II, 344-5, and my note on Men. *Epitr.* fr. 2, Mnem. IV 27 (1974), 17-8[60].

Fenn., Bury, Pu., Farn., Conw., Slater take αἰδοῖος in the passive sense of 'respected', supplying αὐτῷ with ὁμιλεῖν: cf. Sol. 1 D. = 13 W., 6 τοῖς μὲν αἰδοῖον, τοῖσι δὲ δεινὸν ἰδεῖν. But in that case the connection with his ὀργὰ γλυκεῖα is less obvious than if we take the word in the active sense of 'having regard for others' (Dorns. 'voll achtender Rücksicht')[61]. For this use of αἰδοῖος cf. Hom. ρ 578 κακὸς δ' αἰδοῖος ἀλήτης, τ 243 αἰδοίως δ' ἀπέπεμπον, A. *Suppl.* 28-9 αἰδοίῳ πνεύματι, 491 αἰδοῖον πρόξενον[62]. Thu. rightly compares *O.* 13, 2 οἶκον ἥμερον ἀστοῖς, *P.* 3, 71 πραῢς ἀστοῖς[63]. These parallels show that the line need not be "a defence against any imputation that he may have shared the tyrannical tendencies of his family" (Bowra, 125), but belongs to the standard praise of rulers.

37: **μέν.** Commonly taken to look forward to 38 τε (cf. *O.* 4, 14-5,

---

[60] To the references given there may be added England, *The Laws of Plato*, index s.v. asyndeton, explanatory, and Ruijgh, 208-9.

[61] As is rightly observed by Me. This seems to me a stronger argument than that put forward by C. E. von Erffa, Αἰδώς *und verwandte Begriffe* ... (Leipzig 1937), 80, viz. that the next lines mention positive qualities, and Priv.'s reference to v. 39.

[62] Nis.'s 'noble' is too general.

[63] Accordingly, ἀστοῖς should not be translated by 'neighbors' (Nis.).

Denn., 374-6), but 38 does not illustrate his ὀργὰ γλυκεῖα[64]. Consequently, μέν emphasizes αἰδοῖος (see my notes on *O.* 1, 75 and *O.* 7, 32), and τε simply appends another trait (cf. Denn., 497 ff., and see above, on 19 καὶ τόθι).

37: ἀστοῖς. Probably to be connected both with αἰδοῖος and with ὁμιλεῖν: cf. *P.* 2, 96 ἁδόντα δ' εἴη με τοῖς ἀγαθοῖς ὁμιλεῖν.

37: ὁμιλεῖν. Thu. compares *P.* 6, 52-3 γλυκεῖα δὲ φρὴν καὶ συμπόταισιν ὁμιλεῖν / μελισσᾶν ἀμείβεται τρητὸν πόνον (where I take καί to mean 'and especially')[65]. The infinitive is equivalent to a dative of limitation: cf. Hom. K 437 θείειν ἀνέμοισιν ὁμοῖοι, Π 194-5 μετέπρεπε Μυρμιδόνεσσιν ἔγχεϊ μάρνασθαι, K.G. II, 14-5 (who wrongly connect this usage with πρέπει ἰδεῖν, where the infinitive has consecutive force), Schw. II, 360 (who hesitates between instrumental force, consecutive force, and accusative of reference), Ruijgh, 243-4 (who compares both the consecutive and the limitative use of the infinitive to an adverb).

38: νομίζων. Scil. ἦν: 'he was a man practising ...'[66]. For νομίζω 'to practise (as a habit)' cf. Thgn. 279 κακῶς τὰ δίκαια νομίζειν, A. *Cho.* 1002-3 ἀργυροστερῆ βίον νομίζων, E. fr. 87, 3 νομίζοντες τέχνην, LSJ I 1. Thu. wrongly maintains that "die Grundbedeutung des Wortes ist 'einschätzen' ". He thinks that in the present passage this translation is supported by *I.* 5, 2 μεγασθενῆ νόμισαν χρυσόν, but there the verb is accompanied by a predicate[67]. We should rather bear in mind the fact that the archaic Greeks did not draw a sharp distinction between the spheres of thinking and acting: see notes on *O.* 1, 31 ἐμήσατο and 106 μήδεται.

The construction is not periphrastic, for the participle is used as a substantive, just as at Hdt. I 57, 2 ἦσαν οἱ Πελασγοὶ βάρβαρον γλῶσσαν ἱέντες ('men speaking'). See further *O.* 2, 39 χρησθέν, and my note on *O.* 14, 2 λαχοῖσαι.

38: ἐν. 'Within the range of', hence 'according to': see my note on *O.* 14, 17 Λυδῷ ἐν τρόπῳ. The sense is equivalent to an adverb: cf. *O.* 2, 16 ἐν δίκᾳ, LSJ A II 3.

38: Πανελλάνων. Later a political unity (LSJ II), but here (as already at Hom. B 530) simply 'all the Greeks'. Similarly E. *Suppl.* 526 τὸν Πανελλήνων νόμον.

---

[64] Priv. writes that "Senocrate era rispettoso ... nell'allevare i cavalli secondo la legge di tutti gli Elleni", but this is an artificial argument based on an impossible construction (see below, n. 66).

[65] He also quotes *N.* 10, 72 χαλεπὰ δ' ἔρις ἀνθρώποις ὁμιλεῖν κρεσσόνων, but there the construction is different: cf. K.G. II, 35.

[66] Bury's view, "τε stands for αἰδοῖος δὲ ἦν" (similarly Priv.: see above, n. 64), is impossible.

[67] See further F. Heinimann, *Nomos und Physis* (Basel 1945), 73 ff.

38: νόμῳ. 'Usage': cf. *N.* 10, 28 quoted above, Heinimann (above, n. 67), 71. Thu. translates the word by 'Einschätzung' and compares *P.* 2, 43 ἐν θεῶν νόμοις, but there Farn. is probably right in reading νομοῖς 'dwelling places' (cf. LSJ II 1). Norwood (156) calls the phrase νομίζων νόμῳ "a jingle, which all editors would have punctually censured had it occurred in Bacchylides", but the *figura etymologica* occurs in all kinds of Greek literature: cf. e.g. Hom. λ 412 θάνον οἰκτίστῳ θανάτῳ, A. *Pr.* 384 τῇδε τῇ νόσῳ νοσεῖν, Hdt. IX 59, 2 κόσμῳ οὐδενὶ κοσμηθέντες. See further Fehling, 153 ff., espec. 158.

39: θεῶν δαῖτας. 'Sacrifices': cf. Hom. Ω 69 οὐ γάρ μοί ποτε βωμὸς ἐδεύετο δαιτὸς ἐΐσης, γ 336 θεῶν ἐν δαιτί. For piety as a *topos* of praise cf. *O.* 3, 41, *O.* 6, 94-6. It is true that most Greek sacrifices were banquets for men and gods at the same time, but Nis.'s translation 'There was no holiday when he did not entertain' is misleading.

39: προσέπτυκτο. Literally 'he had clasped to his breast': for the meaning 'cherish' cf. ἀσπάζομαι (LSJ 3) and the figurative use of 'to embrace'[68]. See also note on *O.* 10, 98 ἀμφέπεσον.

39: ξενίαν. Probably alludes to the name Ξενοκράτης: cf. Barkhuizen, 84-5, who compares *N.* 7, 61-65-70 ξεῖνος ... προξενίᾳ ... Εὐξένιδα. It should be added, however, that hospitality is a *topos* of praise: see my notes on *O.* 1, 16 φίλαν, *O.* 3, 1 φιλοξείνοις, *N.* 11, 8 ξενίου.

40: οὖρος. Refers to a run of guests. See further Péron, 51-6. Priv. argues that the word is "simbolo del destino mutevole". He compares *O.* 13, 28 and *I.* 3-4, 23, but there οὖρος is qualified by δαίμονος and by ἄλλοτε ἀλλοῖος.

40: ἐμπνεύσαις. The object is ἱστίον: cf. Hom. *H. Bacch.* 33 ἔμπνευσεν δ' ἄνεμος μέσον ἱστίον, Hom. A. 481 ἐν δ' ἄνεμος πρῆσεν μέσον ἱστίον. Péron (55 n. 3) takes ἀμφὶ τράπεζαν to depend on ἐμπνεύσαις (similarly Bury 'blowing on him at his hospitable board'), but the above parallels show that ἐμπνέω ἀμφί cannot mean 'to blow around'.

40: ὑπέστειλε. Péron (52-4) points out the difference between συστέλλειν ("carguer partiellement la voile sur la vergue") and ὑποστέλλειν or ὑφίεσθαι ("amener la vergue avec la voile à la moitié du mât ou à son tiers inférieur"). Thu.'s translation 'liess das Segel erschlaffen' is obviously wrong. The verb is not used in a causative sense (We. 'liess ein Wind seine Segel ihn einziehen', Nis. 'made him furl the sails'), but there is no sharp distinction between man and his physical surroundings: cf. *O.* 1, 33 ἁμέραι δ' ἐπίλοιποι (instead of 'future generations') μάρτυρες σοφώτατοι.

---

[68] C. J. Ruijgh (private letter) compares Lat. *se applicare ad.*

40: ἱστίον. The sail of his hospitality: cf. *P.* 1, 91-2 ἐξίει δ' ὥσπερ κυβερνάτας ἀνὴρ ἱστίον ἀνεμόεν, and Péron, 55.

40: ἀμφὶ τράπεζαν. I have already pointed out that this cannot be connected with ἐμπνεύσαις. When it is connected with ὑπέστειλε, ἀμφί might be taken in the sense of 'somewhere in', 'inside': cf. Hom. Λ 706, *H.Ap.* 475, Hes. *Th.* 554, A. *Pr.* 1029, and my note in Mnem. IV 21 (1968), 80 (so apparently Nis. 'aboard his friendly table'). But the result would be a bizarre mixture of image and reality (cf. Péron, 52, 55-6, who thinks that the bizarrerie is full of humour). It is more natural to take τράπεζαν in the sense of 'meal', and ἀμφί in the sense of 'during': see notes on *O.* 1, 50 and *N.* 11, 9.

41: ἐπέρα. For the imperfect see above, on 16 πέμπεν.

41: Φᾶσιν. One of the limits of ordinary navigation: cf. E. *Andr.* 651, fr. 559, Pl. *Phd.* 109 b 1. For the symbolism of *ne plus ultra* see my note on *O.* 3, 44 Ἡρακλέος.

41: θερείαις. Scil. ὥραις (LSJ θέρειος II).

42: χειμῶνι. Thummer writes: "Dass Pindar durch die polaren Ausdrücke Sommer und Winter auf die 'unausgesetzte' Fahrt des Gastgebers hinweisen und nicht von zwei getrennten Seefahrtszeiten sprechen wollte, ergibt sich aus der Überlegung, dass die Alten im Winter das Meer gar nicht befahren haben". It is true that θερείαις ... χειμῶνι is a 'polar' expression for 'uninterruptedly' and that in such phrases one member of the antithesis is often less relevant than the other, or even illogical (see my note on *O.* 3, 45 χάσόφοις), but I cannot believe that Pindar would have added the contrast Phasis (cold)—Nile (hot) to counterbalance the contrast summer-winter if this did not have any base in real life[69]. It appears from Hesiod's warnings (*Op.* 674 ff.) that there was some seafaring in spring and in autumn, and Pindar's formula summer-winter obviously does not refer to two of the four seasons, but to the two halves of the year: cf. Hom. η 117-8 οὔ ποτε καρπὸς ἀπόλλυται οὐδ' ἀπολείπει / χείματος οὐδὲ θέρευς, ἐπετήσιος[70]. Accordingly, the image emphasizes both the extension and the continuity of Xenocrates' hospitality[71].

[69] I do not feel the 'fine humour' assumed by Fränkel (563) and Kurz, *op. cit.* (above, n. 21), 14.

[70] For navigation in winter (in the strict sense of the word) cf. H. T. Wallinga, Lampas 11 (1978), 272-4.

[71] Péron (86-7) argues that the mention of Phasis and Nile serves to emphasize the qualitative rather than the quantitative aspect of Xenocrates' hospitality: visiting the former in summer and the latter in winter is the most comfortable way of travelling; similarly Xenocrates tries to make his guests feel as comfortable as possible. This is an anachronistic interpretation, for it transforms Xenocrates into a kind of tour-operator. Hubbard's suggestion (12) that "poetic fame can produce a universalizing dissemination of his domestic virtue" is not supported by the context.

42: πλέων. Also belongs to 41: see my note on *O.* 7, 12 ἐν. Cf. also G. Kiefner, *Die Versparung* (Wiesbaden 1964).

42: Νείλου. Another limit of navigation: cf. *I.* 6, 23, Bacch. 9, 41, E. *Andr.* 650.

42: ἀκτάν. The use of the singular seems to show that the delta is meant (Bowra 'shore', Lattimore 'headlands'): cf. LSJ I 2 'tract of land running out into the sea'. The word often denotes a rugged coast or bank, but the banks of the Nile can hardly be called 'steep' (so Nis.). The v.l. αὐγάς, whatever its origin, must be wrong, just as Bury's conjecture ἀγάν (see Farn.).

43: μή. The asyndeton introduces a conclusion (Bo. 'therefore', Thu. 'deshalb'): see above, on 30 καὶ γάρ.

43: νυν. 'In the present case' rather than 'at this moment': see my notes on *O.* 3, 34, *O.* 11, 11, *O.* 14, 15.

43: φθονεραί. Thu. writes: "Im Neid der Kleinen spiegelt sich das Glück der Grossen" (similarly Priv.). It should be added, however, that the references to envy in Pindar's work are not only an indirect way of emphasizing the greatness of human achievements, but also express a defensive attitude: Pindar feels that all greatness, both of the victor and of the poet, is threatened by envy, which hopes to detract from their fame. He tries to ward off this danger (cf. *O.* 8, 55 μὴ βαλέτω με λίθῳ τραχεῖ φθόνος) by emphasizing the trustworthiness of his report and the originality of his art[72]. Self-defence is the reverse side of his self-confidence[73].

It should not be concluded that his fear of public opinion is a neurotic trait in Pindar's character. Rivalry was a formidable power in Greek life[74], and envy pervaded not only the sporting-world[75], but also the literary world[76]. The necessity of maintaining and augmenting one's

[72] Cf. e.g. *N.* 4, 37-43, *N.* 8, 20-2. M. Lefkowitz, *Autobiographical Fiction in Pindar*, HSCP 84 (1980), 29 ff., rightly points out the "combative and defensive tone" of these passages, but wrongly interprets them as "autobiographical mythology": the fear of being criticized was a reality, not a fiction, in Pindar's life. The whole article, in spite of occasional merits, is an objectionable product of Bundyism, as appears from the conclusion (48): "Pindar found in the abstract, impersonal nature of the poet's traditional first-person statement an opportunity to describe for his audience the general meaning of a victor's achievement". See further my remarks in Mnem. IV 36 (1983), 28-9, and my notes on *O.* 1, 112 ἀλκᾷ, *O.* 3, 4 νεοσίγαλον, *O.* 10, 9 ἐπιμομφάν.

[73] Cf. espec. *N.* 4, 37-43, and see further above, n. 36.

[74] Cf. the references in my note on Hes. *Op.* 25 κοτέει.

[75] At *P.* 8, 82 Pindar praises a young wrestler for having flung himself on his adversaries κακὰ φρονέων, wrongly called by Farn. "an unfortunate reminiscence of Π 783 Πάτροκλος δὲ Τρωσὶ κακὰ φρονέων ἐνόρουσεν". For military elements in the ideology of Greek athletics cf. H. W. Pleket, Arena 1 (1976), 76-7.

[76] Hesiod's dictum (*Op.* 26) φθονέει ἀοιδὸς ἀοιδῷ still applies to Pindar's time: cf. S. Gzella, *The Competition among Greek Choral Poets*, Eos 58 (1969-70), 19-32. W. J. Slater, CJ 72 (1977), 198, is certainly wrong in suggesting that "the envious slanderers ... are invented ad hoc according to the argument *ek diaboles* known to the orators".

κλέος, so essential to the epic heroes, persisted in the aristocratic circles of the fifth century[77].

The reference to φθόνος is a *topos* in Pindar (cf. e.g. *P.* 1, 84 ἀστῶν δ' ἀκοὰ κρύφιον θυμὸν βαρύνει μάλιστ' ἐσλοῖσιν ἐπ' ἀλλοτρίοις, and see further my note on *O.* 7, 6 ζαλωτόν), and Norwood (154) and Thu. rightly point out that there is no evidence for the assumption that the poet alludes to the weakened power of the Emmenidae or even to their deposition (cf. e.g. Farn. I, 247-8: "the malicious hopes of the demos to confiscate the wealth of the once royal house"). It may be added that the poet could hardly have appealed to Thrasybulus' generosity if the latter had been in difficult circumstances[78].

43: θνατῶν. Bury suggests that this has the pregnant sense of 'ordinary mortals', "as opposed to the Aenesidamids who took to themselves 'immortal honours' ". But such parallels as *P.* 4, 139-40 ἐντὶ μὲν θνατῶν φρένες ὠκύτεραι / κέρδος αἰνῆσαι πρὸ δίκας δόλιον and fr. 214, 3 Ἐλπις, ἃ μάλιστα θνατῶν πολύστροφον γνώμαν κυβερνᾷ show that the meaning is neutral.

43: ἀμφικρέμανται. Cf. *O.* 6, 74 μῶμος ἐξ ἄλλων κρέμαται φθονεόντων τοῖς, *O.* 7, 24-5 ἀμφὶ δ' ἀνθρώπων φρασὶν ἀμπλακίαι ἀναρίθμητοι κρέμανται. The image probably refers to dark clouds obscuring the steerman's vision: see my note on *O.* 7, 25 κρέμανται.

43: ἐλπίδες. Not "in a wide sense, 'the ideas and surmises' " (Bury), but 'hopes'. Thu. writes: "der Neidische hofft, selbst zu jenem Glück zu gelangen, das er dem andern missgönnt". But the fundamental sense of φθόνος is that of begrudging a person something, and this is not necessarily connected with the desire of getting the other's possession[79]. In the present case the grudging men hope that the victor's success will be soon forgotten.

44: μήτε ... σιγάτω. For the *topos* 'excellence must not be passed over in silence' cf. *O.* 7, 92-3, *P.* 9, 93-4, *N.* 9, 6-7. See also Nisetich, 156 n. 74. He argues (149) that the urge to have the ode performed implies a compliment paid to Thrasybulus. In my opinion, it is rather a compliment paid by the poet to himself.

---

[77] See further Gund., 51-3, 69-70, S. Eitrem, *The Pindaric Phthonos*, in *Studies D. M. Robinson*, II (St. Louis 1953), 531-6, Thummer, 80-1, Bowra, 186-7, H. Lloyd-Jones, JHS 93 (1973), 126 and n. 102, J. Péron, *Le thème du Phthonos dans la XIe Pythique de Pindare*, REA 78-79 (1976-77), 65-83, G. M. Kirkwood, *Blame and Envy in the Pindaric Epinician*, in D. E. Gerber (ed.), *Greek Poetry and Philosophy: Studies ... L. Woodbury* (Chico 1984), 169-83, espec. 181-2.

[78] As is rightly pointed out by Von der Mühll (above, n. 1), 234. See also Pavese, 103-4, and Race, 114.

[79] This is not always borne in mind in discussions of the φθόνος θεῶν.

44: **ἀρετάν.** The 'excellence' of his father, both as a contestant in horse-races and as a ruler: see note on *O.* 1, 13 ἀρετᾶν. Dorns.'s 'den grossen Sinn' is too narrow.

44: **σιγάτω.** Scil. Thrasybulus: the poet now addresses Nicasippus (47).

44: **πατρῴαν.** Nisetich (147) suggests that this means both 'of his father' and 'his (own) inherited'. The latter sense does not suit the context except on the assumption that Thrasybulus is praised not only at 12, but indirectly from 30 on (see above, n. 56).

45: **μηδέ.** 'And therefore not...either'. Similarly *P.* 8, 83-6. For οὔτε...οὐδέ "giving the effect of climax in the second limb" cf. Denn., 193. For consecutive οὐδέ cf. Hom. Λ 330-1 ᾔδεε μαντοσύνας, οὐδὲ οὓς παῖδας ἔασκε στείχειν ἐς πόλεμον, and my notes on Hes. *Op.* 28, 190, 236, and on A. *Pr.* 212 in *Miscellanea ... Kamerbeek*, 457.

45: **ὕμνους.** Not this ode and a skolion (fr. 124 ab), as is assumed by Fenn. and Farn., but an amplifying plural: see above, on 30 δόμοι, and note on *O.* 1, 105 ὕμνων.

46: **οὐκ ἐλινύσοντας.** For the litotes see above, on 12 οὐκ ἄγνωτα. The poem has to become active, i.e. has to be performed, in order to spread the victor's fame (cf. *N.* 5, 1-3). Simpson (473) suggests that the verb alludes to "the poems for sale with painted faces waiting for customers", but this is excluded (1) by the parallel *N.* 5, 1-3, and (2) by the fact that ἐλινύω does not mean 'stand idly about', but 'take rest', 'keep holiday', and so cannot refer to poetry called ἐργάτις (6)[80].

47: **ταῦτα.** Referring to a single object (the present ode): cf. K.G. I, 67-8, Schw. II, 44. 'All this' (Nis.) wrongly suggests that the contents of the poem are meant.

47: **Νικάσιππε.** Perhaps an assistant (just as Aeneas *O.* 6, 87), who is to supervise the performance of the ode (Bury)[81]. Thu. plausibly suggests that the name alludes to 13 ἵπποισι νίκαν, but the assumption that it also expresses the hope of a future victory of Thrasybulus (Nisetich, 147-8) goes too far.

47: **ἀπόνειμον.** Thu.'s translation 'vermelde' (similarly We. 'bring vor') cannot be right. Bury maintains that the verb "would have to mean '*deal out* to Thrasybulus as his share' " (cf. Nis. 'dispense'), which does

---

[80] Dorns.'s translation 'säumig' (explained by "ebenso rasch improvisiert wie vor 20 Jahren Pythia 6") is obviously wrong. Silk, *op. cit.* (above, n. 2), 166 n. 1, thinks that there is a "slightly sardonic" contrast between ἐλινύσοντας and ἐργασάμαν. But here and at *N.* 5, 1 ἐργάζομαι simply means 'make', without any suggestion of hard work (similarly *O.* 6, 3 ἔργου).

[81] Croiset (above, n. 36), 97 n. 3, compares Euripides' assistant Cephisophon and Aristophanes' χοροδιδάσκαλοι Callistratus and Philonides (Schmid, *Gesch. d. gr. Lit.*, III, 320 n. 8, 816 n. 4, IV, 154 n. 14).

not suit the context, and that "it may have been a technical expression for some function of the chorêgos". Farn. rightly rejects the scholiast's explanation 'read', and thinks that 'dedicate to his use' may be similar to the common meaning 'apportion'. But 'to his use' is not the meaning of ἀπο-, but forms part of the meaning of νέμω, as appears e.g. from S. *Aj.* 265 εἰ νέμοι τις αἵρεσιν, E. *Hipp.* 745 ναύταις οὐκέθ' ὁδὸν νέμει, Ar. *Av.* 384 ἐμοὶ δεῖ νέμειν ὑμᾶς χάριν. The meaning of ἀπο- is 'as his due': cf. ἀποδίδωμι, etc.

48: ξεῖνον. For the *topos* of friendship between the poet and his client see my notes on *O.* 1, 16 φίλαν, *O.* 3, 45 οὔ νιν διώξω, *O.* 7, 4 γαμβρῷ. I doubt whether ξεῖνον echoes 39 ξενίαν, as is suggested by Nisetich (148), who thinks that "Pindar implicitly praises Thrasyboulos for showing a kindred ξενία to the poem itself". Friendship and hospitality are closely connected, but the one need not imply the other, and the addition of ἠθαῖον seems to show that the word simply means 'friend'[82].

48: ἠθαῖον. Doric for ἠθεῖον. The addition of 'dear'[83] is intentional: B. A. van Groningen, *La composition littéraire archaïque grecque* (Amsterdam 1958), 72, rightly observes that in choral poetry "on constate une tendance, toute naturelle, à donner au dernier élément un accent particulier d'intensité. Au désir de bâtir au début le 'splendide fronton' correspond celui de terminer par une phrase à grand effet, sentence, proverbe, expression remarquable, prière, note personnelle". In the present case there is a close connection between the final "note personnelle" and the opening of the poem: by emphasizing the intimacy of their friendship Pindar strengthens his appeal to the generosity of Thrasybulus. On the other hand, I do not believe that the compliment contained in ἠθαῖον harks back to 4 καλός (Nisetich, 148).

48: ἔλθῃς. For the construction cf. S. *Phil.* 141 σὲ δ', ὦ τέκνον, τόδ' ἐλήλυθεν πᾶν κράτος. More often ἱκνέομαι is construed with a simple accusative of the person: cf. K.G. I, 311-2.

---

[82] A similar trace of Bundyism is to be found in the view of W. J. Slater, CJ 72 (1977), 197, who maintains that "since it was an axiom for Greeks that *xenoi* avoid envy and praise their hosts, therefore Pindar claims to be a *xenos* as an argument in favour of his encomium".

[83] The epic parallels show that Bowra (125) is wrong in thinking that "ἠθαῖος means no more than 'honoured' [similarly Priv.] and conveys no strong note on affection".

INDEX OF SUBJECTS

Numbers not preceded by p. refer to the lines of the odes discussed in the commentary.

abstractum pro concreto *O. 10*, 72, *I. 2*, 18
active
for middle *N. 11*, 26
accusative
cognate *O. 1*, 109, *O. 10*, 64, 72, 76, 78, 79, *O. 11*, 13, *N. 11*, 24, 27
of direction *I. 2*, 48
of route *O. 10*, 64
as subject *O. 1*, 10
adjective
causative *O. 1*, 2, 8, 24, 26, 105, *O. 10*, 4, 51, 85, *I. 2*, 2, 5, 19, 28
compound *O. 10*, 6
= genitive of substantive *O. 10*, 15, 26, 28, *I. 2*, 3
used as substantive *O. 1*, 31
analogy pp. 2, 54
anaphora *O. 10*, 28, *N. 11*, 4
antithesis *O. 10*, 29
aorist
coincident *O. 1*, 92, *O. 10*, 45, 48
subjunctive *N. 11*, 13
apo koinou *I. 2*, 42
archer
poet as *O. 1*, 112
Ares *O. 10*, 15
article
'the well-known' *I. 2*, 9
anaphoric *O. 1*, 37, *O. 10*, 56
deictic *O. 10*, 1, 55, 66
generic *O. 1*, 8
possessive *O. 10*, 77, *O. 11*, 19
with proper names *O. 1*, 1
artistic sense *O. 1*, 15, 104, *O. 10*, 14, *O. 11*, 18, *N. 11*, 7, *I. 2*, 12
aspiration *N. 11*, 48
associative connection *O. 10*, 15
assonance *N. 11*, 38
asymmetry *O. 1*, 14
asyndeton *O. 10*, 71
consecutive *O. 1*, 71, 114, 115, *O. 11*, 11, *I. 2*, 30, 43
motivating *O. 1*, 53, *O. 11*, 16, *I. 2*, 12
specifying *I. 2*, 37
attribute
more than one *O. 1*, 59
auditory display *O. 1*, 3, *O. 10*, 79, 84, *O. 11*, 14, *N. 11*, 7, 18
beauty
physical *O. 10*, 99, 103, *N. 11*, 12
blame *O. 10*, 9
brachylogy *N. 11*, 19
Calliope *O. 10*, 14
character *O. 11*, 20
chariot
of the poet *O. 1*, 110, *I. 2*, 2
charioteer *I. 2*, 19
chiasmus *O. 10*, 29
chronology p. 96
colour *N. 11*, 28
comparative
'too ...' *N. 11*, 22, 48
composition pp. 2, 54, 87, 96
contrast *O. 1*, 2
courage *O. 1*, 81, 96, *N. 11*, 32
darkness *O. 1*, 83
dative
of agency *N. 11*, 7
of interest *O. 1*, 23, 106, *O. 10*, 32, *N. 11*, 38
of limitation *O. 1*, 87, 89, 116, *O. 10*, 66, 103, *O. 11*, 10, *N. 11*, 13, 41
modal *O. 1*, 102
of occasion *O. 1*, 50, *O. 10*, 76, *N. 11*, 21
possessive *O. 1*, 23, 65
of purpose *O. 10*, 20
debt
ode as *O. 1*, 103, *O. 10*, 3
defender
poet as *O. 1*, 112, *O. 10*, 88, *O. 11*, 9, *I. 2*, 43-4
diversity
of human life *O. 1*, 113, *O. 11*, 20
divine
favour p. 2, *O. 1*, 25, *N. 11*, 3, *I. 2*, 18
inspiration *O. 11*, 10
miracles *O. 1*, 28, 76
morality *O. 1*, 35
powers *O. 1*, 1, 53, *O. 10*, 4, *N. 11*, 8, 24

thrones *N. 11*, 2, *I. 2*, 5
education *O. 10*, 20
ellipse
of εἰμί *N. 11*, 48
of internal object *O. 1*, 109, *O. 10*, 64, 72, 76, 78, *O. 11*, 13, *N. 11*, 27
of object *O. 1*, 49, *N. 11*, 36
of ὅρα *O. 10*, 10
of supplementary idea *O. 1*, 63, *O. 11*, 10, *N. 11*, 24, *I. 2*, 12
of 'thither' *N. 11*, 25
of verb *O. 1*, 2
enallage *O. 1*, 48, *O. 11*, 3
enjambement *O. 1*, 23
envy *O. 11*, 7, *I. 2*, 43
epic forms *I. 2*, 23
eroticism see pederasty
etymologizing *O. 10*, 45, 51, 54, 71, 79, *N. 11*, 17, 18, *I. 2*, 9, 26, 39
exertion *O. 10*, 22, 93, *O. 11*, 4
facility
of composition *I. 2*, 33
failure *O. 10*, 17, *N. 11*, 22
fame *N. 11*, 17, *I. 2*, 30
growing *O. 10*, 95, *O. 11*, 6
father
praise of *N. 11*, 11
fee *I. 2*, 8, 12
figura etymologica *I. 2*, 33
fire *O. 10*, 36
foil *O. 1*, 25, *O. 10*, 17, *O. 11*, 7-9, *N. 11*, 22, 29
foreknowledge *N. 11*, 46
four *O. 1*, 60
fox *O. 11*, 19
friendship *O. 1*, 16, 75, 103, 116, *O. 10*, 6, 12, *I. 2*, 11, 12, 48
future
approaching *O. 10*, 7, 35
unpredictable *N. 11*, 43-6
future
with ἄν *O. 1*, 110
desiderative *O. 1*, 36, 105, *O. 10*, 12, 79, *O. 11*, 16
prospective *O. 1*, 85
genitive
of agency *N. 11*, 27, *I. 2*, 34
partitive *O. 1*, 50, *N. 11*, 48
of quality *O. 10*, 47
of reference *O. 10*, 25
gods see divine and myth
gold *O. 1*, 1, 41, *O. 11*, 13, *I. 2*, 1, 26
graphic description *O. 10*, 65, *I. 2*, 2
greed *N. 11*, 47
hendiadyoin *O. 1*, 18, 38
Heraclitus *O. 1*, 1
heroism *O. 1*, 83
Hestia *N. 11*, 4, 6
honey *O. 10*, 98-9, *N. 11*, 4, 6
hope see ἐλπίς
hospitality *O. 1*, 16, *O. 11*, 17, *N. 11*, 8, *I. 2*, 39
humour *O. 10*, 3, *I. 2*, 12
ignorance *N. 11*, 43-6
imagery
of binding *N. 11*, 45
of building *I. 2*, 8
of clouds *I. 2*, 43
of coming *O. 1*, 8, 111, *O. 11*, 16, 19, *I. 2*, 34
of dice *I. 2*, 26
of driving *O. 1*, 110
genealogical *O. 11*, 3
of hunting *N. 11*, 47
of light *O. 1*, 23, *O. 10*, 23, *I. 2*, 17
nautical *N. 11*, 44, 46, *I. 2*, 40-2
of shooting *O. 1*, 112, *I. 2*, 3
spatial *O. 1*, 22, 78, 86, *O. 10*, 42, 98, 104, *I. 2*, 2, 10, 29, 39
of throwing *I. 2*, 35
vegetative *O. 10*, 95, *O. 11*, 6, 10, *N. 11*, 38
of way *I. 2*, 33
immortality *O. 1*, 1, 6, 7, *O. 11*, 5, *N. 11*, 17, *I. 2*, 26, 28
imperative
absolute *O. 10*, 1
imperfect *I. 2*, 16, 41
infinitive
of limitation *I. 2*, 37
as object *N. 11*, 23
in prayers *N. 11*, 10
inheritance *N. 11*, 11, 12, 30, 33
internal object see accusative, cognate
internal subject *O. 10*, 76
inversion
of subject and object *O. 1*, 19, 53, 81, *O. 10*, 88, 93
jurisdiction *O. 1*, 12
justice *O. 10*, 13, *N. 11*, 8
knees
of the gods *I. 2*, 26
Kronos *O. 10*, 49-50
light *O. 1*, 1, 23, *O. 10*, 23, *I. 2*, 17, 20
lion *O. 11*, 19-20
litotes *O. 1*, 104-5, *O. 11*, 18, *I. 2*, 12, 20, 30, 33, 46
lyre *O. 10*, 93
mannerism *O. 1*, 22, 36, 53, *I. 2*, 10
measure *I. 2*, 21
metre pp. 1, 53-4, 87, 96, 119, *N. 11*, 17, *I. 2*, 17

middle
  'have oneself ... done' *N. 11*, 28, *I. 2*, 16
moderation *N. 11*, 45-8
mortality *N. 11*, 15, 46
Muse *O. 1*, 112, *O. 10*, 3, *I. 2*, 34
myth *O. 1*, 26, 27, 28b, 32, 35, 43, 46, 47, 48-51, 52, 53, *O. 10*, 15, 24, 27, 49-50, 54
native land *N. 11*, 20
ne plus ultra *O. 1*, 114, *I. 2*, 41
negative expression *O. 1*, 81, 86, 108, *O. 11*, 17, and see litotes
neutral
  plural for singular *O. 1*, 52, *I. 2*, 47
number
  of verb assimilated to apposition *O. 1*, 28b
  id. to predicate *O. 11*, 6
object
  resultative *O. 10*, 45
Olympia *O. 10*, 51
Olympic games *O. 1*, 3, 7, 10-1, *O. 10*, 24
opportunity *O. 1*, 69
originality *O. 1*, 111
participle
  expressing main idea *O. 10*, 57, *N. 11*, 5
Patroclus *O. 10*, 19
pederasty *O. 1*, 41, *O. 10*, 99, *I. 2*, 3
perfect
  intensifying *O. 1*, 94, *O. 11*, 8
  resultative *O. 1*, 91
personification *O. 1*, 1, 8, 10, 53, *O. 10*, 4, 15, 36, 80, *N. 11*, 8
pessimism *N. 11*, 45
piety *I. 2*, 39
pleonasm *O. 10*, 65, *I. 2*, 15
plural
  amplifying *O. 1*, 94, 105, *O. 10*, 84, *I. 2*, 30, 45
  distributive *O. 10*, 21
  first person *O. 1*, 7, *O. 10*, 12, 79
  verb after plural neuter *O. 10*, 85, *N. 11*, 42
polar expression *O. 10*, 15, 35, *O. 11*, 19
politics *I. 2*, 43
Poseidon *O. 1*, 26
predicate
  of internal object *O. 1*, 57
  resultative *O. 1*, 68, 112, *O. 10*, 95, *N. 11*, 5, 20
present
  desiderative *O. 1*, 80
  imperative *O. 1*, 85
  prospective *O. 1*, 5, 64
Presocratics *N. 11*, 16
priamel *O. 1*, 1, 6, 100, *O. 11*, 1-6
pronoun
  personal *O. 1*, 111
prytaneum *N. 11*, 1, 3
public opinion *I. 2*, 43, and see λόγος
question
  absolute *O. 10*, 60
religion *O. 1*, 52, 112, *O. 10*, 21, 97, *O. 11*, 10, *I. 2*, 31, 39
repetition *N. 11*, 10, *I. 2*, 11
risk see courage
romanticism *O. 1*, 71, *N. 11*, 11
seafaring *I. 2*, 42
schema kath' holon kai meros *O. 1*, 68, *N. 11*, 11
schema Pindaricum *O. 11*, 6
self-address *O. 10*, 10
self-confidence *O. 1*, 116, *O. 10*, 87, 95, *I. 2*, 12, 43-4
self-preoccupation *I. 2*, 12
sight *O. 1*, 94, *I. 2*, 43
simile *O. 10*, 9, 86, *O. 11*, 19
singular
  for plural *O. 10*, 94
sound
  correspondence of *O. 1*, 12, and see assonance
space *O. 1*, 94
spatial terms see imagery, spatial
substantive
  desiderative *O. 1*, 56, *N. 11*, 47
sun *O. 1*, 6, 94
sweetness *O. 1*, 19, 109, *O. 10*, 3, 93, 98, *O. 11*, 14, *N. 11*, 18, *I. 2*, 7, 36
swiftness *O. 1*, 110
symmetry p. 3
synaesthesia *O. 1*, 23, *O. 10*, 73
synizesis *O. 10*, 70, *N. 11*, 18
Terpsichore *I. 2*, 7
Themis *N. 11*, 8
thinking
  and acting *O. 1*, 31, 106, *I. 2*, 38
thirteen *O. 1*, 79
time *O. 1*, 33-4, *O. 10*, 7, 53, 55
tradition *O. 10*, 78
trainer *O. 10*, 17
truth *O. 1*, 28b, *O. 10*, 4, 54, *I. 2*, 10
unity see composition
verb
  used absolutely *O. 1*, 29, *O. 10*, 24
verbal adjective
  active *N. 11*, 48
vicissitude *O. 1*, 100, *N. 11*, 38
violence *O. 10*, 27, *N. 11*, 14

vocative *I. 2*, 1
warlike spirit *O. 1*, 23, *O. 10*, 15, 99, *O. 11*, 19
water *O. 1*, 1, *O. 10*, 10, 85
wealth *O. 1*, 2, *O. 10*, 88, *N. 11*, 13
weapons
as living beings *O. 1*, 112
word order *O. 1*, 37, 108, *O. 10*, 30, 34, 57, *O. 11*, 17, 19, *N. 11*, 16, 26, *I. 2*, 11, 12
Zeus *O. 1*, 42, 57, *O. 10*, 4, 45, 51, *N. 11*, 2

INDEX OF GREEK WORDS

ἀγλαία 'splendid victory' *I. 2*, 18
ἀγλαός *O. 1*, 91
ἄγω 'guide' *N. 11*, 42
ἄεθλος 'labour' *O. 1*, 84
ἀεί
  distributive *O. 1*, 99
ἀέναος 'everlasting' *N. 11*, 8
ἀθύρω *O. 1*, 16
αἰδοῖος 'regardful' *I. 2*, 37
αἰδώς *O. 10*, 105
αἰθήρ *O. 1*, 6
αἰθύσσω *O. 10*, 73
αἱμακουρία *O. 1*, 90
αἰπύς 'overwhelming' *O. 10*, 42
αἱρέω 'get' *O. 1*, 88
ἀλάθεια *O. 10*, 4, *I. 2*, 10
ἅλιξ 'companion' *O. 1*, 61
ἁλίσκομαι 'be killed' *O. 10*, 42
ἀλλά
  calling to action *O. 1*, 17, 84, *O. 10*, 3
  progressive *N. 11*, 9
ἀλλὰ γάρ *O. 1*, 55
ἄλσος *I. 2*, 28
ἀμύμων *O. 10*, 27
ἀμφί 'during' *O. 1*, 50, 97, *I. 2*, 40
ἄν
  omitted *O. 11*, 20
  position of *N. 11*, 26
ἀνά 'somewhere in' *I. 2*, 27
ἀναδέω *N. 11*, 26, *I. 2*, 16
ἀναιδής *O. 10*, 105, *N. 11*, 45
ἄναξ *O. 10*, 49
ἀναφέρω 'give forth' *N. 11*, 38
ἀνήρ = αὐτός *N. 11*, 11
ἀνθέω 'abound' *O. 11*, 10
ἄρα
  emphatic *O. 10*, 52
ἀραρώς 'provided with' *O. 10*, 83, *I. 2*, 19
ἀρετά 'excellence' *O. 1*, 13, *I. 2*, 44
  'outstanding achievement' *O. 10*, 20, *O. 11*, 6
ἄριστος *O. 1*, 1
ἀτρεκής *O. 10*, 13
αὐτός
  pleonastic *I. 2*, 15
αὐχέω *N. 11*, 21
ἀφθόνητος 'abundant' *O. 11*, 7
βαθύς 'high' *O. 10*, 8
βάλλω 'place' *N. 11*, 30
βία 'strength' *N. 11*, 14, 22
βρέμω *O. 11*, 20, *N. 11*, 7
γάρ
  emphatic *N. 11*, 24, *I. 2*, 30
  motivating unexpressed thought *I. 2*, 12
γαρύω *O. 1*, 3, *O. 11*, 4, *I. 2*, 3
γίγνομαι 'turn out to be' *I. 2*, 33
γλυκύς *O. 1*, 19, 109, *O. 10*, 3, *I. 2*, 36
δαίδαλος *O. 1*, 29, 105, *N. 11*, 18
δαίμονες *O. 1*, 35
δέ
  after apostrophe *O. 1*, 36
  consecutive *O. 1*, 100, *O. 10*, 16, 39, *N. 11*, 17
  inceptive *O. 10*, 15
  motivating *O. 1*, 30, 99, *O. 10*, 20, *N. 11*, 19, 37, 39
  specifying *O. 10*, 30, 55, 84, 87
δέω *N. 11*, 45
δέχομαι *N. 11*, 3
δοῦπος *N. 11*, 18
δύναμις *O. 1*, 104
δῶμα Διός *O. 1*, 42
Δώριος *O. 1*, 17
ἐθέλω 'to be wont' *O. 11*, 9, *N. 11*, 40
εἰ
  with optative *O. 11*, 4, *I. 2*, 34
ἐκ-
  intensifying *O. 1*, 29
ἐλινύω *I. 2*, 46
ἐλπίς *N. 11*, 22, 46, *I. 2*, 43
ἔλπομαι 'expect' *O. 1*, 109
ἐν
  'according to' *I. 2*, 38
  'in addition' *O. 10*, 73
  instrumental *O. 1*, 15, *N. 11*, 17
  'near' *I. 2*, 18
  'at the occasion of' *N. 11*, 9
ἐναμείβω *N. 11*, 42
ἐνσχερώ *N. 11*, 39
ἐπί 'on account of' *O. 1*, 113, *O. 11*, 13
ἐπι- intensifying *O. 10*, 3
  intentional *O. 10*, 9
ἕπομαι 'fall to' *N. 11*, 43
ἐρατός *O. 10*, 99, *I. 2*, 31
ἔρημος *O. 1*, 6
ἔρχομαι 'fall to' *O. 1*, 100
ἐτεός *I. 2*, 10
ἐτήτυμος *O. 10*, 54

ἑτοῖμος 'ready to hand' *O. 1*, 69
εὐ- 'good at' *O. 1*, 73, *I. 2*, 17
εὐάνωρ *O. 1*, 24
εὐδία *O. 1*, 98
εὐρύς 'widely extending' *O. 1*, 42, *O. 10*, 95
εὐφροσύνα *O. 1*, 58
εὖχος 'thing boasted of' *O. 10*, 63
ἔψω 'use up' *O. 1*, 83
ἦθος *O. 11*, 20
ἦτορ *O. 1*, 4
θάλαμος *N. 11*, 3
θαλπνός *O. 1*, 6
θέμις *O. 1*, 12, *N. 11*, 8
-θεν *O. 1*, 94
θεός *O. 1*, 64, 106, *O. 10*, 21
θοός *O. 1*, 110
θερμαίνω 'please' *O. 10*, 87
καθαρός *O. 10*, 45
κάθημαι 'sit idly' *O. 1*, 83
καί
  adversative *O. 1*, 28
  'also' belonging to a whole clause *O. 1*, 28, *I. 2*, 23
  'in turn' *O. 10*, 30
  specifying *I. 2*, 19
καὶ γάρ *I. 2*, 30
καίνυμαι *O. 1*, 27
καιρός *I. 2*, 21
κατα-
  intensifying *O. 10*, 55, 63
κελαδέω 'sing loudly' *O. 1*, 9, *O. 11*, 14
κέρδος 'desire of gain' *N. 11*, 47
κίνδυνος *O. 1*, 81
κλυτός *O. 1*, 105, *I. 2*, 2
κομπέω *I. 2*, 32
κορυφή 'excelling instance' *O. 1*, 13
κόσμος 'composition' *O. 11*, 13
κῶμος *O. 11*, 16, *I. 2*, 31
λαγχάνω
  of tutelary deities *N. 11*, 1
λιπαρός *I. 2*, 20
λόγος 'common talk' *O. 11*, 5, *N. 11*, 17
  'fact' *O. 1*, 28b
μακαρίζω *N. 11*, 11
μαλ(θ)ακός *I. 2*, 8
μεγάνωρ *O. 1*, 2
μέλαινα γῆ *N. 11*, 39
μείων 'non-existent' *O. 1*, 35
μέλι *O. 10*, 98, *O. 11*, 4, *N. 11*, 18, *I. 2*, 3, 7, 32
μέλλω *O. 10*, 7
μέν
  emphatic *O. 1*, 75, *I. 2*, 37
μὲν ... ἀλλά *O. 10*, 86
μετά 'and' *O. 10*, 49
μή
  omission of *N. 11*, 23
μηδέ
  for μήτε *O. 11*, 18
μήδομαι 'make', 'act' *O. 1*, 31, 106
μηκέτι *O. 1*, 5
μῆλον 'fruit' *O. 1*, 12
μῆτις *O. 1*, 9
μίγνυμι *O. 1*, 22, *I. 2*, 29
μναστήρ 'reminding' *I. 2*, 5
μουσικά *O. 1*, 15
μῦθος *O. 1*, 29
νομίζω 'practise' *I. 2*, 38
νῦν 'in the present case' *O. 10*, 9, 78, *O. 11*, 11, *I. 2*, 43
οἰκεῖος *N. 11*, 31
ὀξύς *N. 11*, 48
ὁράω 'look with favour' *I. 2*, 18
ὀργά *I. 2*, 35
ὀρθός 'prosperous' *N. 11*, 5
ὅρκιον 'pledge' *O. 11*, 6
ὅστις = εἴ τις *I. 2*, 4
οὐδέ 'and therefore not' *I. 2*, 45
παίζω *O. 1*, 16
παπταίνω *O. 1*, 114
παρκείμενον *O. 1*, 69, *N. 11*, 48
πᾶς = παντοῖος *O. 10*, 23, 82
πελώριος *O. 10*, 21
πνέω 'aspire' *O. 10*, 93
  'be disposed' *I. 2*, 25
ποικίλος *O. 1*, 29
πολιός *O. 1*, 71
πολύφατος *O. 1*, 8
πόρος 'river' *O. 1*, 92, *O. 10*, 48
πορφύρεος *N. 11*, 28
ποταμός *O. 1*, 92
πού τι *O. 1*, 28, *I. 2*, 24
πράσσω 'accomplish' *O. 11*, 4
προμάθεια *N. 11*, 46
πρόσωπον 'façade' *I. 2*, 8
πτυχή *O. 1*, 105
σαφής *O. 10*, 55, *N. 11*, 43
σοφός *O. 1*, 9, *O. 11*, 10, 19, *I. 2*, 12
στάδιον *O. 10*, 64
σύν 'by the aid of' *O. 1*, 110, *O. 10*, 21, 105
  'at the occasion of' *O. 10*, 58
  resultative *N. 11*, 10
  with substantive = adverb *N. 11*, 9
ταῦτα = τοῦτο *I. 2*, 47
τε 'and ... belonging to it' *O. 10*, 59
  consecutive *I. 2*, 18, 25
  with participle *N. 11*, 45
  after relatives *N. 11*, 1

single *O. 1*, 32
specifying *O. 1*, 41, *O. 10*, 11, *O. 11*, 19, *N. 11*, 45
supplementary *I. 2*, 19, 37
τέκμαρ *N. 11*, 44
τελετά 'ceremony' *O. 10*, 51
τέλος 'office' *N. 11*, 9
τι 'bad' *O. 1*, 64
τιμά 'value' *O. 1*, 31
τις
reinforcing *O. 1*, 28, *O. 10*, 22, 93, *I. 2*, 24
τιτρώσκω *N. 11*, 10
τὸ δέ 'on the other hand' *N. 11*, 43
τόνος 'course' *O. 10*, 64
τράπεζα 'meal' *O. 1*, 50, *N. 11*, 9, *I. 2*, 40
τρόπος *O. 10*, 77
ὕπατος *O. 1*, 42, *N. 11*, 2
ὑπέρ 'above' *I. 2*, 36
ὑπέροπλος *O. 1*, 57
ὑποστέλλω *I. 2*, 40
φάος *O. 10*, 23, *I. 2*, 17
φέρω 'gain' *O. 10*, 59, 67
φθόνος *I. 2*, 43
φίλιος *O. 1*, 75
φίλος *O. 1*, 4, 16
φυά *O. 10*, 20, 21, *O. 11*, 19, *N. 11*, 31
φυλάττω 'maintain' *N. 11*, 5, *I. 2*, 9
φώς *O. 1*, 46, *I. 2*, 1, 21
χάλκεος *O. 10*, 15
χάρις *O. 1*, 18, 30, 75, *O. 10*, 12, 78, 94, *I. 2*, 19
χρῆσις 'need' *O. 11*, 2
χρύσεος *O. 1*, 1, 41, *O. 11*, 13, *I. 2*, 26
ψεῦδος *O. 1*, 29, *O. 10*, 5
ὦ *O. 10*, 3